DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 887 SP 006 571

AUTHOR	Purcell, Edna Jean, Ed.
TITLE	Future Directions for Teacher Education in Wisconsin Public Higher Education. Centennial Conference Proceedings.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Oshkosh.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	89p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; Economic Factors; *Educational Change; Educational Demand; Laboratory Schools; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Teacher Experience
IDENTIFIERS	Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

This is a report of the centennial conference of the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. Included are details of centennial activities, topics of discussions, the highlights of a speech by Karl Massanari on performance-based teacher education, and highlights of discussions, even down to transcripts of group discussions. Topics and problems covered in this report include limiting enrollments in teacher education, teacher preparation and field experiences, certification and licensing procedures, and the general future of teacher education. (JA)

ED 077887

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

IN WISCONSIN

PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Centennial Conference Proceedings

David L. Bowman, Conference Chairman
Dean, School of Education

EdnaJean Purcell, Editor
Associate Professor
School of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The School of Education is proud of its 100 years of service and dedication to excellence in teacher education. Through institutional transition from Normal School to Teachers College, to State College, to State University, and now as a part of the University of Wisconsin, teacher education has remained a central institutional function. With the merger of the two public university systems, it seems appropriate that dialogue begin immediately among those concerned with teacher education from both systems. What are the major issues facing those charged with preparing teachers for tomorrow's schools? How can limited state resources for this important function be most wisely and efficiently utilized?

This Wisconsin oriented teacher education conference, as part of the Centennial celebration, offered selected educators an opportunity to become acquainted, to identify issues of importance as well as plausible positions to be taken on them, and to react to speakers and panelists of state and national distinction.

SP 006 571

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

MARCH 3 AND 4, 1972

PROGRAM FEATURES

Friday, March 3

Afternoon Workshop Session: Future Directions for Wisconsin Teacher Education

Social Hour

Banquet Address: Accountability in Teacher Education

Dr. Karl Massanari, Associate Secretary, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Saturday, March 4

Reaction Panel

Moderator:

Mrs. Robert R. Williams; University of Wisconsin Board of Regents, Education Committee

Panelists:

Martin Haberman; Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Rolf Larson; Executive Director, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

John McDonnell; Wisconsin Education Association Field Consultant in Higher Education

Alan F. Quick; Director of Student Teaching, Central Michigan University

Lond Rodman; Director of Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Allen Slagle; Head of Academic Affairs, University of Wisconsin System

James Stoltenberg; Executive Secretary, Wisconsin Improvement Program; Director of Clinical Experiences for Teachers, University of Wisconsin-Madison

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory Statements and Conference Greetings 3

David L. Bowman, Dean of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh 4

Roger E. Guiles, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh 4

Leonard Haas, Executive Vice-President, University of Wisconsin System 5

Mrs. Robert R. Williams, Board of Regents, University of Wisconsin System 8

Workshop Session

Listing of Discussion Groups and Leaders 10

Principle Topics Considered 11

Social Hour and Banquet

"Performance Based Teacher Education - The State of The Art" Dr. Karl Massanari 26

Reaction Panel Discussion

Identification of Significant Issues 34

Proceedings of the Panel 35

Summary of the Discussion 77

Post-Panel Discussion Session 79

Appendix A: Conference Participants 80

Appendix B: Brainstorming Ideas from a Workshop Group 82

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

IN WISCONSIN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

A Centennial Conference

University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

Future Directions for Teacher Education in Wisconsin Public Higher Education, an invitational conference for deans and faculty of Wisconsin Schools of Education, was a significant part of the Centennial Observance of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, held in March, 1972.

Chancellor Roger E. Guiles and Dr. David L. Bowman, Dean of the School of Education, issued invitations to administrative personnel and education faculty at all of the thirteen four-year institutions in the newly merged University of Wisconsin System. Representatives of each campus attended. Also present were representatives of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, of various state public school teacher associations, superintendents of schools and educational administrators of numerous school districts, and national teacher education accreditation agencies.

The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Centennial Invitational Conference on Education opened with a demonstration of closed circuit television in teacher training research.

Vice-President Leonard Haas of the University of Wisconsin System presented pace-setting greetings to 200 educators in attendance at the two-day conference, the first of its kind since the university merger.

In welcoming conference participants, Chancellor Guiles and Dean Bowman explained the purposes of the conference to be (1) to outline major issues confronting teacher education in Wisconsin; (2) to provide ways for dealing with these issues; and (3) to offer suggestions that might resolve those issues.

Dean Bowman: Good afternoon. It is good to have so many of you here, despite the rather traditional early March weather. Remember the old adage, "March comes in like a lion and goes out like a lamb." Well, I've seen him do that many times, and I'm sure you have, but never before have I heard him actually roar, and seen his eyes flashing! Yes, we had hail, sleet, wind, ice, snow, thunder and lightning on March first in Oshkosh. I was very happy to see the sun shine yesterday and today because I knew that might clear things up, and many of you would be here.

At this time it gives me great pleasure indeed to introduce Dr. Roger E. Guiles, Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh who will provide the official welcome to this institution, Dr. Guiles.

Chancellor Guiles: Welcome to the conference on the Future Directions in Teacher Education. This is a most appropriate subject and a most appropriate time for such a conference. I do not need to tell this group that education is being challenged as never before, from Kindergarten through the graduate school. In a sense this is a tribute to education because we tend to become anxious about those things that are important to us.

The American people have demonstrated a great faith in education, and now there is a growing awareness that the goals are not as easy to achieve as once may have been assumed. The spectrum of individual and societal needs, the spectrum of career goals, the spectrum of learners and backgrounds of abilities all seem to have been widened. A situation as complex as this does not lend itself to simplistic programs and to patent medicine-type solutions. At the heart of the matter are the teachers, and supporting the teachers are the schools that help him or her prepare to meet the challenge.

As individuals you represent persons and institutions having this responsibility as a major concern. As you accept the challenge and the potential of the sessions getting under way, be assured of our best wishes and hopes for a successful and meaningful conference. We hope today and tomorrow will be good days indeed. Thank you very much.

Dean Bowman: I'm sure I speak for all the education faculty when I say that we are fortunate to have a chancellor with your rich background of professional education preparation and a wealth of experience in Wisconsin public schools and teacher preparation and in higher education, Dr. Guiles.

I had hoped to have Regent Williams, who is going to be on the program tomorrow, say a few words of welcome on behalf of the regents. But I think the Stevens Point car is somewhere between that campus and Oshkosh. We hope they have not had any mishap.

President John Weaver and Vice-President Leonard Haas have been most supportive of this conference idea from the first time we contacted them. President Weaver is out of the state, and Vice-President Haas is in Madison "minding the store;" however, we do have a video-taped welcome prepared by Vice-President Haas, which we will now run.

Vice-President Haas: Video tape from Madison, Wisconsin, Dr. Leonard Haas, Executive Vice President, University of Wisconsin System.

Colleagues and professional educators from near and far: It is a very special honor and privilege for me to represent President John Weaver and the University of Wisconsin System on this auspicious occasion. The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh School of Education, the officials of the university and particularly those who are members of the staff in the School of Education are to be complimented for using this opportunity to bring a new awareness not only to those who are gathered here but to education all over the nation as to the current needs and problems in professional education.

It is most fitting and proper that the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh should avail itself of the opportunity for this very special weekend involving outstanding educators from all over the country and calling attention to the educators of Wisconsin the role to be played by the university in the education of teachers for tomorrow. After all, the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh and others who have

come into the University of Wisconsin System as Wisconsin State Universities had their being as normal schools, with the development of the first one at Platteville in 1866 and with the formation of the latest to be added in Eau Claire in 1916, the pattern was established for this state that would enable Wisconsin to provide teachers for the elementary and secondary schools to raise the level of learning so this state could rank among those that were foremost in educational opportunity.

It is not unexpected that in an atmosphere in which the importance of education has so often been enunciated that so many of the important programs in carving a way for a new method of preparing teachers and for new areas of influence should have had their start here. Movements such as the beginning of the kindergarten, the development of the junior high school course of study, the new developments in the open schools, have been attached to work that has been done in institutions in Wisconsin.

We are familiar with many of the fine accomplishments of the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh in the area of teacher education, with the interest recently in reaching teachers for the inner core of our large cities, for the development of programs that would break down the rigid classification of classes in the classroom, in the experimentation that would suggest that through the use of new teaching devices and of a different kind of preparation for teachers that this institution, together with others in our state, may again lead the way.

We trust that in this conference there will be an exchange of ideas that relate to the problems which we face in education today, problems that evolve from the high cost of education, from that characteristic which we have all long sought, namely the ability to serve even larger numbers of people, as well as finding ways to aid those who may be disadvantaged and for whom education will serve as the principle means by which future happiness in life can be secured.

As we look forward to the future in the years ahead at a time when our population will stabilize, at least for a decade or two, at a time when we will pay less

attention to the physical facilities that we have had to develop in such an unusual way in the last two decades, that more of our funds can be used for experimentation, for providing greater opportunities and securing greater happiness on the part of the people we serve because we can then deemphasize the material aspects of life and seek out those joys that are going to come from opening the doors of the mind.

Several weeks ago it was my privilege and opportunity to be on this campus and to view the very excellent facilities in which the School of Education here operates. This is characteristic now of what has happened throughout the state of Wisconsin. We congratulate you for the excellent planning that has taken place, and we express our gratitude to the citizens of Wisconsin for providing the financial resources for facilities of this kind. But beyond the facilities there is the more important element, the people. You who are members of the faculty and the administrative staff provide the direction in which this university shall move. Those who provide the same direction at other institutions are the elements that will determine the success and the future of our education program in elementary and in secondary education.

Again I express thanks on behalf of the University of Wisconsin System. This is an effort that has involved bringing together representatives of all of the institutions in this new vast system of some 12,000 faculty members and 130,000 students. May your conversations and your discussions not only stimulate you while you are here but lead to the opening of new opportunities when you return to your places of employment.

Dean Bowman: Thank you, Vice-President Haas. During his remarks we located Mrs. Williams and she has graciously agreed to bring a word of welcome from the Board of Regents. Mrs. Robert R. Williams.

Regent Williams: On behalf of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, I am happy to welcome all of you to this conference on the Future Directions for Teacher Education as one of the events which is part of the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Centennial observance. I am happy to be here as a participant for several reasons. I think it is a privilege to become better acquainted with this building and with the School of Education here. I am glad to see that the technological facilities and equipment are being used to a great extent today. I'm glad to be participating in a conference looking at opportunities and new meanings and directions for teacher education. I can't think of any subject that will have more significance for the future of everyone in this country. Of course I would feel that way because I am studying for a Master of Arts in Teaching degree at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, and I am presently student teaching So of course I think teacher education is important.

I am also working on a committee looking at programs for minority and disadvantaged students. One of the first things that came to the attention of this committee is that this subject can't be separated from teacher education which has to do with the preparation of students in the primary and secondary schools. There are many ways in which all of these subjects come together and are encompassed in teacher education.

It is a privilege to be here. I hope that everyone accomplishes a great deal. I hope to meet all of you, too.

Dean Bowman: Thank you, Mrs. Williams.

There are nine workshop groups in this building. All are on video hook-up now. There are University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh faculty hosts to make you comfortable and there should be a conducive atmosphere for group discussions.

We have purposely avoided much structuring of the content dimension of these workshop groups. We want participants to feel free to direct attention to pervasive issues of our society and to imminent issues resulting from the recent merger of

the present University of Wisconsin System fiscal picture, or other developments in Wisconsin.

Hopefully our discussions today and tomorrow will (1) identify major issues confronting teacher education in Wisconsin; (2) provide for dialogue regarding plausible positions to be taken on these issues; (3) offer suggestions for action that might resolve these issues.

We are recording all contributions to the conference both today and tomorrow, and we do hope to publish the proceedings.

Have a good session!

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

The workshop sessions on Friday afternoon had for their theme, "Future Directions for Teacher Education in Wisconsin Public Higher Education". Each discussion group was composed of educators having a common interest and included a guest who was also a Saturday morning panelist. Deans, department heads and staff personnel from the thirteen institutions of the University of Wisconsin System, superintendent of schools and educational administrators participated. Discussion groups were led by members of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. Names of the leaders and their group constituents follow:

Dean David Bowman, Dean of the School of Education:
Schools of Education Deans

Dr. Leonore Dickmann, Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education:
Language Arts, Reading, and Social Studies

Dr. Theron Freese, Associate Dean, School of Education:
Assistant and Associate Deans and overflow visitors

Dr. Richard R. Hammes, Coordinator of Educational Research:
Curriculum, Supervision, Research, Administration, Superintendents, Public Schools, Assistant Deans

Dr. E. J. Hutchinson, Director of Student Teaching and Field Experiences, Secondary Education:
Clinical Experiences, Campus Schools, Educational Technology

Dr. William A. Jones, Department of Educational Psychology:
Social and Psychological Foundations

Mary Martha Mueller, Assistant Professor, Department of Elementary Education:
Elementary Education and Early Childhood Education

Dr. Donald R. Parson, Assistant Professor, School of Education
Art, Music, Math, Physical Education, Science

Dr. Earl Stahl, Jr., Chairman, Counselor Education:
Special Education and Counselor Education

As the discussion groups considered the future directions of teacher education in the State of Wisconsin, there was a thread of agreement on concerns and a marked degree of unanimity in opinions expressed regarding problems facing the educational systems in the State of Wisconsin.

From a lengthy list of suggested discussion items the group of Education Deans, Assistant and Associate Deans, representing all thirteen of the University of Wisconsin System's degree-granting campuses, focused on two issues:

1. Search for a formula for determining the funding of the College of Education not based on the traditional contact hours and credit hours produced;
2. The recently adopted requirement of a human relations component in all teacher education programs leading to Wisconsin certification.

Limitation to the "credit hours produced" base for funding departments of education was viewed as a restricting factor preventing departments from enjoying financial resources commensurate with the magnitude and worth of the teacher education function. The presently established funding base was felt to fail to recognize adequately the importance of the individual and small group nature of effective teacher education. Provisions to enable conduct of research and follow-up of graduates were also seen as essential to teacher education.

There was unanimous dissatisfaction with the present funding provisions, but none of the discussants was able to express an alternate that met the test of feasibility. Some did indicate limited success in efforts to arrive at understandings with academic departments whereby savings possible through large group instruction are reflected in secondary teacher education programs.

The topic was left with agreement that a necessary first step will be to develop a way to ascertain a relationship between costs and benefits.

The Human Relations certification standard was discussed in considerable detail by almost all present. Some expressed unhappiness with the standard's specificity and focus on process. Others, however, appeared to welcome the standard with all its problems because it is better than nothing. It was observed that now teacher educators are required to do something about the problem and that the impact of this requirement is tempered by the latitude permitted individual institutions in developing their own approaches.

The suggestion that the deans, as a group, determine how they would interpret the requirement was not adopted. It was felt best to enable each institution to develop its own program based on its own interpretation.

Another discussion group asked the following question and made these comments:

HOW DO WE IMPLEMENT THE NEW DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION INITIAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS IN THE AREA OF HUMAN RELATIONS?

1. One institution plans a required course in its general education program.
2. This is a much bigger and broader problem than the programs of Schools of Education.
    a. Work must actually start in the home if human relations attitudes are to change materially.
3. If the teacher education student lacks acceptable qualifications in the area of human relations, but is all right otherwise, are we going to be willing to deny him certification?
4. Some communities, unfortunately, are not yet ready for new teachers with good human relations attitudes and skills and may reject them.
5. The need for more and better minority group candidates for teacher education, as part of the solution to this problem area, is affected by the current over-supply of teachers.
6. There is, in fact, a degree of dis-jointedness and lack of correlation between human relations efforts in the universities and the public schools.
7. Emphasis on human relations is needed all the way through and not just in programs of teacher preparation.
8. New teachers going out are asked to fit in where they go and must not expect to change things quickly, yet we cannot afford to have them going out not expected to work for change.
9. We must be alert to human relations opportunities outside the university in the communities.
10. We need to focus more on seeking human relations experiences and breaking the great stress on courses and credits.
11. In some cases student teachers and university supervisors of student teachers find themselves rejected by cooperating teachers, by principals, by students, and by parents because they have different ideas, attitudes, concerns in the area of human relations.
12. One of the dilemmas faced by Schools of Education is that they must prepare teachers to go out and potentially face a wide spectrum of programs and community attitudes.

Limiting Enrollments in Teacher Education Programs

The change in the balance of supply and demand, combined with the projected drop in school populations and the need to up-grade teaching competencies provided a background for ideas generated in several groups.

The discussion of one group proceeded as follows:

Teacher Supply and Enrollments in Teacher Education

1. Should we have restricted or unrestricted enrollments?

2. There are potential problems when some institutions in a system restrict and others don't. There are reports of students applying at non-restricting campuses when denied admission at a restricting campus in the system.

3. An unresolved question is that of the basis on which any restriction might reasonably be made.

    a. There was consensus that grade point averages are not a significant factor for screening.

    b. One institution reported restriction on a first-come, first-served basis with a waiting list. They indicated that restriction was based on lack of adequate clinical laboratory stations, not on an attempt to control teacher supply.

4. Any attempts to restrict enrollment are contradictory to and inhibitive of attempts to attract increased enrollments from minority groups.

5. Chapter 37 institutions traditionally have had open enrollment (within minimum requirements) for all programs.

6. Is there in fact a teacher shortage?

    a. How valid a yardstick is current supply and demand?

    b. Should we react or plan ahead?

7. Is enrollment restricted to balance supply with demand or to improve the quality of the product? Some believe that limiting enrollment will improve quality of the product.

8. How valid a reason for restricting enrollments is the current shortage of available teaching positions?

    a. Are jobs plentiful for most majors in Letters and Science?

    b. Is not the teacher education program good preparation for people as consumers of education: parents, board members, voters?

    c. Is not the teacher education program good general education?

9. Some fiscal questions are real and pertinent.

a. Are taxpayers today willing to pay the bill for preparing surpluses in the labor market?

b. The system office, the regents, the legislature, and the governor may have an impact through budget determinations.

c. The regents may make some program and quota decisions affecting this matter.

10. Earlier clinical experience within the professional preparation program can help in screening for the ultimate market.

11. The current teacher surplus within the state is resulting in a push in some communities for faculty house-cleaning. Some school boards are questioning the expenditure of time and money in efforts to improve teachers in-service when they are inclined to feel that they could hire better teachers as replacements if they let teachers go.

Another group summarized its ideas on the concept in this paragraph:

Two phenomena, the general oversupply of teachers and the under-supply of finances, appeared to stimulate discussion on the need, desirability, legality, and ethic of limiting enrollments in teacher education programs. Some question was raised as to whether a publicly-supported institution could legally or ethically control the market in production of teachers. A further question was whether enrollments should or could be regulated on the basis of the supply and demand principle. The opinion was voiced, however, that no one has an inherent right to professional training, whether it be in medicine, law, clergical, rabbinical, or teacher education. If such a principle is operative, it was felt that the profession not only has the right but the responsibility to place quality limitations on its candidates as they prepare to practice in the profession. No clarification was made as to what such quality criteria might be or whether such criteria would be applied as entrance or exit requirements. It was pointed out that in a unified state system of higher education, member institutions need to provide consistent requirements across institutions so that geography will not become a discriminating factor in acceptance into or rejection from the teacher education program.

Preliminary Screening for Teacher Education

The development of a screening process for teachers and teacher candidates will help insure education of the best possible personnel. Characteristics of a

good teacher must be identified, and an evaluative device capable of measuring these characteristics must be developed and applied to teacher candidates. The educational development of those students identified as possessing the desired characteristics must begin as early as possible. This is necessary in order to develop self-confidence, provide direction, and increase meaningfulness through the proper combination of theory, method, and practice. The most delicate problem of screening will most likely be the question of legality of selection and civil rights.

Teacher Preparation and Field Experiences

Changes needed in teacher education programs, teaching competencies and specific professional sequences are highly relevant in the thinking of contemporary education. This was reflected in the discussions of the conference.

Changes in Teacher Preparation Programs

After a not unexpected consensus for early experience in teacher education programs, a novel idea for preparation was offered to stimulate thinking in future directions. It was suggested that universities maintain responsibility for academic and theoretical aspects in higher education but eliminate from universities the responsibility for the experiential facets of the teacher preparation programs. The dollars saved in such a development would then be allocated to the other agencies, such as CESA's, to provide appropriate field training for potential practitioners.

It was further hypothesized that the Educational Center idea could be utilized in this respect, where local educational agencies and universities work jointly and cooperatively to provide the teaching methods and student teacher supervision phases of the program through the Clinical Professor approach. Other participants encouraged keeping the experiential aspects of the program in the university setting where controlled clinical experiences and analysis of teaching might be accomplished.

* * * * * * * * * *

The Directors of Field and Clinical Experiences and Campus Schools considered the following ideas:

A. That the State of Wisconsin review the status and its commitment to the field of education;

B. That the role of the public schools in teacher education become defined and interpreted in the total preparation program;

C. That reciprocal contributions of clinical and field experience be identified as a laboratory for the university and a work force for the public school;

D. That several cooperative arrangements for university and public school personnel to work together offer considerable potential;

   1. Released time of supervisors to be compensated for by the State.

   2. Establishment of a position in the public schools paid for on a joint basis to facilitate a teaching station while eliminating excessive travel and other expense.

   3. Dual appointment to tie methods classes, clinical seminars, and problems classes to the realities of field experiences for the purpose of providing in-service to the schools and students-oriented situations for the university.

E. That a three-year partnership between the university, the public schools and the State Department of Public Instruction in the clinical aspect in the junior year, student teaching in the senior year, and an extended or third year residency with provisional certification be considered;

F. That the need for and the place of the Campus School be emphasized for its contribution to field experiences of all kinds and as the major ground for testing of educational theory;

G. That the desired outcomes of field experience should be so defined that their accountability in relationship to individual needs and achievement justify time designations rather than prescribed clock hours or number of weeks. This involved the defining of purposes and components of field experiences and providing of experiences which are offered early and continuously.

H. That the search for a definitive list of qualities of good teacher should not be an excuse for procrastination. While not necessarily agreeing on individual entries, teacher educators <u>do</u> know or <u>should</u> know what they believe constitute the teaching act. Accordingly, students should be able to function within the definitions, provide future evidence, and be accountable for certain agreed upon competencies.

<u>Evaluating Our Product</u>

The problem of evaluating our product - the teacher - to identify his strengths and weaknesses was discussed at great length. Can we, as educators, specify the desirable end behaviors, and if so, can we change behavior to meet those desirable

ends? Under the present system, grade point average and student teaching performance in the senior year are the criteria we use. Both criteria are suspect, since academic success is not a good predictor of successful classroom teaching and evaluations of student teaching are very subjective and may serve to perpetuate the status quo. Furthermore, we are hesitant to eliminate students from our programs at such a late date.

The following possible solutions to the evaluation problem were suggested.

1. Reduce class size at the university level to enable instructors to know more about the students than sheer academic performance.
2. Establish a qualifying exam or a check list of skills on which the student must show competency.
3. Institute a bachelor of education degree without certification since this might free college professors to do a more honest job of student teacher evaluation.
4. Offer a five-year program including one full year of internship to enable more people to evaluate the student in a wider variety of settings.
5. Withhold certification until three years of successful teaching has been completed.
6. Screen students at a freshman and sophomore level through supervised classroom experiences.
7. Involve public schools and/or the state department of public instruction more directly in the certification procedures.
8. Use student evaluations in the process of evaluating student teaching performance.
9. Change the basis for allocating money to teacher training institutions so that quality rather than quantity can be emphasized.

In concluding the discussion, the consensus of opinion was that we definitely need changes in our teacher training programs; but we must be careful of the direction of the change.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Other questions asked about teacher preparation were:

WHAT ELEMENTS DO WE WANT AND NEED IN OUR PRODUCT? AND WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR OUR PROGRAM?

1. The performance-based teacher education movement demands that we pay increased attention to the product of our programs.

2. We need to study what students say they want in teachers.

   a. They seem to want the same things that we do.

3. How do we determine whether students can or cannot do certain things before we recommend for certification?

   a. Competency-based certification poses this as a very real problem.

4. We tend to teach as we were taught.

5. On what bases can we deny certification?

   a. Can we deny certification on the basis of professional judgement?

   b. Are matters of personality, character, values bases on which we can deny certification?

   c. Do we deny significant numbers? No!

   d. Can we separate graduation from certification?

Certification and Licensing Procedures

Procedures for exiting from the professional sequence of education and for being admitted as new teachers to the field occupies the attention of leadership in higher education.

In some conference groups the problems of certification and licensing were discussed in relationship to teacher preparation programs.

The Wisconsin Improvement Program certification procedure was mentioned whereby the certification decision is made after the first full professional year, with the university and the local education agency making the joint decision. It was also suggested that the licensing procedure for teachers might be patterned after that of law, where a state exam must be passed after completion of the preparation program and totally independent of it.

Competency

Competency-based or course based certification is an important issue for the future direction of teacher education. The question of leadership in defining competency is raised. At the present time, the Department of Public Instruction is the leading force in this process, allowing each individual college (School

of Education) the responsibility to establish its certification requirements, with necessary approval from the DPI.

Whether there is a need for course objectives in the form of behavioral objectives is a point of disagreement. Since there is lack of agreement in defining teacher competence, discussion is futile until behavioral objectives are specified. There must be agreement on what should be stressed in teacher education. Students should know the objectives stressed by each teacher. Although this would interfere with one set of behavioral objectives, the leeway may be necessary, since it is not presently known just what makes any one course or instructor "good".

Questions relating to competency include the following:

Should we exclude course work and use some other method of teacher preparation?

Why is every course worth three credits?

Do we know what we are trying to accomplish in teacher education?

Is credit just a matter of logistic and administrative convenience?

How can the competency of newly-trained teachers be evaluated? Schools can give assurance, but poor schools might approve anyone.

Could program approval be a basis for defining specific student needs? What is the means by which the student's achievement is measured?

How are present programs effecting the individual? Students are looking for the significance of what they are required to do.

It was suggested that public schools are moving further away from competency. If a teacher can keep children quiet, she is considered good. Effective teachers are not always rewarded.

What do we consider a good teacher? One who teaches facts or helps children to feel good about themselves? Perhaps, there should be more focus on professional courses than on academic.

There is a lack of status in areas other than verbal. No academic prestige is given for vocational and behavioral areas of study. This tradition of verbal concepts is an obstacle.

Responsibility

The question of responsibility was discussed. It was suggested that the school which produces teachers is responsible. The DPI approves schools for what

they say they are doing. If teachers are not competent, the school is at fault.

It was further suggested that, perhaps, not enough of the onus is placed upon schools and that incompetencies of teachers are left up to administrators and to other teachers.

The statement was made that the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification would agree with what had been discussed up to this point in the meeting.

Certification

There was much discussion of the lack of agreement in defining a good teacher or counselor.

Who should decide? Administrators? Students? Peers?

Should students negotiate their own contracts as to what they will study? It was suggested that such a program would need to assume student responsibility. The Institute of Education in Milwaukee where students set up their own programs was mentioned. It was stated that some students use it as an easy way out.

Should teacher education have so many academic courses?

Should all preparing teachers get the same training, when there is such disparity among their abilities and personalities? Should background make a difference? There is an assumption that the student knows nothing. The possiblity of evaluating students to see if they might be able to bypass some courses was discussed. The background of the student might not be related to teaching.

The question of time was also discussed. Is four years long enough? Too long? It was suggested that there is more to learn, but we want to do it in less time. The closing of two-year institutions for teacher preparation was brought up. It was suggested that the question of time is superficial.

Control of Certification

In Maine, teachers threatened to boycott universities. They would not attend the universities until their demands for certain courses were met.

It was mentioned that substitute programs frequently turn out to be identical to university requirements.

It is possible that certification will be placed entirely in the hands of teachers, in the form of a council operated by WEA. All certification records and people employed in certification would be transferred to this commission. Teachers would be required to renew their certification yearly for a fee. This fee would be used to operate the commission. All would then have to be WEA members.

California now operates with such a commission. It remains to be seen whether this will alter requirements for teacher certification. The commission is hoping to take over responsibility for recognizing colleges as suitable which are for training teachers.

It was suggested that teachers should have more control, but not complete control, in the matter of certification since it is a political question.

It was further stated that teachers would control curriculum of teacher education programs in colleges if such a commission were formed. The NEA is pouring money into eleven states for the formation of these commissions.

It was stated that the ferment in education today is a positive change in that we are being forced to examine our practices.

Public School Responsibility

Should public schools be expected to assume some responsibility for teacher training? It was stated that this has been attempted. Fiscal rewards would be made available for public schools involved in teacher training. The program was crossed out with budget cuts, but may be reinstated in the future.

It was suggested that university money might be allocated for this purpose.

A statement was made that school and college community relationships are improving, and that eventually undergraduate teacher training will take place in the public school. Some schools and colleges share the cost of a campus school.

Cooperative Teacher Education

There is some question and a great deal of diversity of thought concerning the competitive vs. the cooperative status of education at all levels. In terms of the tax dollar, or personnel, and of teacher preparation these view points seem to have impact.

Several conference groups attempted to deal with this topic.

The teacher education institutions should no longer bear the entire responsibility for producing a finished, polished, and completely proficient teacher. Instead the teacher education institutions would concentrate their energies upon producing a competent basic teacher within a specific educational area. This responsibility would necessitate the careful selection and continual evaluation of teacher candidates, as suggested in the first approach.

Upon graduation, the teacher would enter a period of internship or residency with a public school district. The responsibility of the public schools would be to identify and make provision for, any particular education the teacher may need to fit him or her to the specific position the board wishes to fill. The residency would not be that of a full-time teacher, but rather that of an apprentice operating under the direct supervision of a skilled teacher whose specific responsibility has been delegated by the school board.

During the residency phase of a teacher's education the Department of Public Instruction would work closely and concurrently with the public schools. Teacher certification would result not from the completion of university credits but from evaluation of teaching competencies. There is a need for educational associations to be active participants during the residency phase, and in the future they probably will be involved in each individual phase of teacher education and selection.

Relationships Between Public Schools and Teacher Education Institutions

1. Best patterns of working relationships between Schools of Education and public schools are an important area of concern.

2. Schools of Education must find ways to work more closely with the public schools in in-service programs.

3. Schools of Education must establish improved credibility with the public schools.

   a. There is a tendency for teachers to reject Schools of Education and in-service courses.

      (1) If salary schedules didn't reward credits, School of Education summer sessions would die on the vine.

4. Perhaps, a post-student teaching, pre-total licensure internship should be required.

5. There is need for improvement of pre-service involvement with students.

   a. More pre-student teaching clinical experiences are needed.

   b. There is a need for more shared staff between public schools and Schools of Education.

      (1) Staff members working on both sides of back and forth.

      (2) Clinical teachers and administrators who are simultaneously on both staffs.

6. Concern was expressed at evidence of growing organized opposition among teachers to taking student teachers.

   a. This is related to supply and demand.

   b. This is related to remuneration.

7. De facto tenure for beginning teachers is related to the entire problem of screening for admission to teacher education, preparation for teaching, and screening for licensure.

   a. Beginning teachers appear in fact to have tenure the moment they begin their first day of teaching.

   b. What is referred to as "job pick" is appearing in proposed contracts in negotiations. The person with the greatest seniority may demand any available position so long as he meets the minimum certification requirements.

Unity of Universities and Practitioners

A major idea relative to future directions of teacher education, particularly as they are influenced by the university merger, was that of the need to include a broader base of support and input as university programs in teacher education are planned and changed. Specifically, it was felt by one group that it is imperative for practitioners in local education agencies to be included in the planning and implementation of teacher preparation programs. Without such support and input,

it was felt that the university-based teacher education program would lose viability and, eventually, its function as an institution for preparing teacher practitioners.

The University of Wisconsin System Merger

Merger-Mission Issue Relative to Teacher Education

A feeling became evident in the group that the discussion should become focused on future directions that may be linked specifically to the fact and direction of a merged system of higher education in the State. The general consensus was one of inevitability of unique and differentiated missions for the various campuses in the system, and that such differentiation will also apply to teacher education in the State. Further general agreement was reached on the point that if such decisions were obviously going to be made, it behooves professional educators as interested parties to provide input into such decision-making. Again, the tightness of finances was seen as an issue with which to be concerned, not only in that universities will be competing for tax dollars, but that universities and school systems will be competing for the same tax dollars in the future. That projection, coupled with the oversupply of teachers, could lead to the possibility that if professional educators cannot make a better case for their program, some professional education schools may be "differentiated" right out of existence.

Self-Study in the University System

A major idea emanating from one group was that of the need for a "self-study" on the part of each School of Education in the State to determine strengths and weaknesses. Such an evaluation would be necessary before any differentiation of programs could be forthcoming. A major problem with the "self-study" was seen to be that of natural "pride" or "bias" where institutions may be unlikely to voluntarily cut or eliminate a program for the benefit of the whole. All participants did not perceive this to be a major road-block in the pursuit of such a study.

Other Problems

Other major ideas emanated from discussions: One was that teacher education programs in the State of Wisconsin should be viewed as a single, unitary program. The conceptualization of a single state-wide teacher education program would imply: (1) differentiation to minimize duplication, and (2) open transfer capabilities on the part of teacher education students throughout the sister institutions. Two problems raised relative to the unification concept were: (1) the potentially laborious process and virtual impossibility of making changes on a particular campus which is perceived as one part of a total program; and (2) the demand of such a program for mobility on the part of students necessitated by their desire and/or need to become involved in program emphases at a number of institutions.

Other major concerns included: (1) a need for the development of a continuous communication system within the schools of education of the UW System. I suppose this is one that goes beyond (or, perhaps, below) the administrative level. (2) An underlying need was expressed regarding being united but not losing the individuality of each institution.

SOCIAL HOUR AND BANQUET

Social Hour for Conference Participants

Following the workshop sessions on Friday afternoon, a sherry hour was held at Pollack Alumni House. An opportunity was provided for guests and hosts to meet socially, renewing old acquaintances and making new ones.

Banquet

A highlight of the invitational centennial conference was the banquet, held in Reeve Memorial Union. Music for the evening was provided by the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Bel Canto Choir, directed by Mr. M. Curtis Diskson.

Table favors for guests at the occasion were charm bracelets and tie tacks bearing the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh ensignia.

Dr. Adolph I. Winther, retired Dean, School of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, was honored for his many years of outstanding service to the university, the State of Wisconsin, and teacher education. Dean Bowman presented him with a marble centennial plaque with his name engraved. To "help" him enjoy his retirement years, Dr. Winther was given a dozen golf balls, along with a ball retriever . . . . should any of them land in the water!

Performance Based Teacher Education

The speaker at the banquet was Dr. Karl Massanari, Associate Secretary, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. He is head of a national task force on accountability in teacher education. Dr. Massanari's address, "Performance-Based Teacher Education: The State of the Art," was based on the following material.

What is Performance-Based Teacher Education?

Much traditional teacher education is experience-based. The goals usually are unspecified in detail; the emphasis is on entrance requirements; they are credit-

grade oriented; and the instruction depends heavily on lectures and textbooks.

By contrast, in performance-based programs, goals are specified, and agreed to, in rigorous detail in advance of instruction. The emphasis is on exit requirements; the student must be able to demonstrate the specified competencies; and instruction is personalized and individualized.

The student must either be able to demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning or exhibit behaviors known to promote it. He is held accountable for attaining a given level of competency in performing the essential tasks of teaching; the training institution is itself held accountable for producing able teachers. Emphasis is on demonstrated product or output. Acceptance of this basic principle has program implications that are truly revolutionary.

Historical Context of PBTE

The basic ideas of PBTE are not new; teacher educators have always recognized that teaching performance is the ultimate measure of their success.

The roots of PBTE lie in general societal conditions and the institutional responses to them characteristic of the Sixties. But it should be emphasized that the response of teacher education to societal change has been scattered, partial, sporadic, and tentative.

The education profession itself has matured. First, there have been important advances in the art and science of teaching. For example, evaluation and assessment are more highly sophisticated than they were a decade ago, thanks largely to the greater availability of research funds. Beginning with the massive studies by Ryans published in 1960,[1] we know much more than we did about teacher characteristics. More recently, the teaching act itself has been exhaustively analyzed. At least 200 observational category systems have been developed, of which Flander's

---

[1]Ryans, David G., Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal: A Research Study. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1960

Interaction Analysis and its variations are the best known. It has been argued that the more teacher trainers know about requirements for success in the teaching act, the more precisely they can establish program goals and assess performance, both important aspects of PBTE.

Second, a more secure body of teachers, most of them with four to five years of college preparation, seem to be winning the struggle for a greater voice in certain decisions that directly affect them. Their goals now encompass greater control of preparation programs and entry into the profession. Thus PBTE ideally involves the cooperation of teacher organizations.

Good student teaching programs are incorporating some of the ideas espoused in PBTE, but the factors pushing us to reform what we are doing include the following:

1. Inequality gaps (minorities and decision-making, etc.);
2. Federal involvement in exploratory programs;
3. Economic conditions: accountability to the taxpayers;
4. Development of educational technology: new resources for learning;
5. Business and industry entering the field;
6. New concepts of management: systems approach, feedback, revisions, renewal;
7. The press by youth for relevance and a voice in their education;
8. Maturation of the profession itself.

A Description of PBTE

Some authorities prefer the term "competency-based teacher education" rather than "performance-based teacher education," suggesting that it is a more comprehensive concept. In determining competency, three types of criteria may be used: 1) knowledge criteria, to assess the cognitive understandings of the student; 2) performance criteria, to assess the teaching behavior of the student; and 3) product criteria, to assess the student's ability to teach by examining the achieve-

ment of pupils taught by the student. The term "performance-based" tends to focus on criterion #2, although proponents of PBTE do not mean so to limit the concept. The adjective itself is relatively unimportant if there is consensus on what elements are essential to distinguish performance- or competency-based programs from other programs.

Essential Elements

1. Competencies (knowledge, skills, behaviors) to be demonstrated by the student are derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles, stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies, and made public in advance.
2. Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies; explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions, and made public in advance.
3. Assessment of the student's competency used his performance as the primary source of evidence; takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behavior; and strives for objectivity.
4. The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency rather than by time or course completion.
5. The instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of competencies specified.

Implied Characteristics

1. Instruction is individualized, personalized, and modularized.
2. The learning experience of the individual is guided by feedback.
3. The program as a whole is systemic.
4. The emphasis is on exit, not on entrance, requirements.
5. Instruction is modularized with a set of learning activities intended to facili-

tate the student's acquisition and demonstration of a particular competency.

6. The student is held accountable for performance, completing the program when, and only when, he demonstrates the competencies that have been identified as requisite for a particular professional role.

Related and Desirable Characteristics

1. The program is field-centered.
2. There is a broad base for decision making (including such groups as college/university faculty, students, and public school personnel).
3. The protocol and training materials provided to students focus upon concepts, skills, knowledges (usually in units called modules) which can be learned in a specific instructional setting.
4. Both the teachers and the students are designers of the instructional system.
5. The program is open and regenerative; it has a research component.
6. Preparation for a professional role is viewed as continuing throughout the career of the professional.
7. Instruction moves from mastery of specific techniques to role integration.

Impact of PBTE

The motive power for the PBTE movement arises not so much from teacher education institutions themselves as from the greater society. These same pressures are felt in state departments of education, in the professional associations, and in the public schools. Changes are already beginning and they will be both fundamental and massive. Because similar pressures affect several different but related groups, we can expect cooperative action.

As the pressures continue, the following results are visible within teacher education institutions:

. much greater program flexibility, permitting students to progress at their own rate, with many alternatives and options;

- greater attention to specific skill training;
- greater congruity between objectives and the evidence admitted for evaluation purposes;
- better rationalization of faculty decisions and demands affecting students; and
- development of new facilities and technology required by PBTE.

Many questions are raised by the implications of PBTE. These include:

1. the need for sharing of decision-making power and responsibility between teacher education institutions, state departments, professional associations and the public schools. Roles must be redefined.
2. the evaluation and promotion of in-service teachers.
3. the need for new kinds of curriculum with emphasis on independent study.

The Promise of PBTE

The promise of PBTE for improving teacher education lies primarily in the fact that:

1. its focus on objectives and its emphasis upon the sharing process by which those objectives are formulated in advance are made explicit and used as the basis for evaluating performance;
2. a large share of the responsibility for learning is shifted from teacher to student;
3. it increases efficiency through systematic use of feedback, motivating and guiding learning efforts of prospective teachers;
4. greater attention is given to variation among individual abilities, needs, and interests;
5. learning is tied more directly to the objectives to be achieved than to the learning resources utilized to attain them;
6. prospective teachers are taught in the way they are expected to teach;
7. it is consistent with democratic principles;
8. it is consistent with what we know about the psychology of learning;

9. it permits effective integration of theory and practice; and
10. it provides better bases for designing research about teaching performance.

Problems, Issues, and Concerns

1. The problem of a philosophic base for PBTE. Does it have a strong enough philosophic base? It may be desirable to emphasize more divergent, creative, and personal experiences during the the first years when such programs are being installed. Examples include: a) developing in the student the self-confidence to remain immersed in a learning experience long enough and deeply enough to make the assimilation of that experience personally relevant; b) encouraging a wide-angled, existentialist vision of his learning experience that will enable him to remain open to unpredicted learning outcomes; c) developing independent and interdependent thinking; d) helping the student to clarify his preferred learning and teaching styles and allowing him to develop them.
2. The scope of PBTE programs. What should be its scope? Should it include all academic areas, realms of affective education? Will it produce technicians and paraprofessionals or will they be professionals?
3. The criterion problem: What will be accepted as <u>evidence</u> of successful performance?
4. Problems related to broadening the base for decision making.
5. Management problems.
6. Problems related to certification.
7. Extent of student involvement.
8. <u>Difficult</u> problems in the area of assessment: how to develop appropriate measurement devices to help measure teacher performance.
9. Possible "band wagon" effect of the movement.

Advantages of PBTE

Among the most promising advantages of PBTE are:

1. its attention to individual abilities and needs;
2. its focus on objectives;
3. its emphasis upon the sharing process by which these objectives are formulated and used as the basis of evaluation;
4. its efficiency, enhanced by the use of feedback;
5. and its student and program accountability features.

Conclusion

The advantages of PBTE would seem sufficient to warrant and ensure a strong and viable movement, given intelligent leadership and adequate support for research to strengthen the thin knowledge base, particularly in the field of measurement, upon which it must rest.

Prepared by:

Karl Massanari, Director of the PBTE Project and
Associate Director of AACTE

January 1972

REACTION PANEL DISCUSSION

Identification of Significant Issues

Numerous significant questions were raised by members of the discussion panel at the Saturday morning session of the Centennial conference on future education.

Significant issues which were identified included the following:

1. Is there a future for teacher education in the State of Wisconsin?
2. How can the University System use the year of moratorium on new programs to best advantage? How can self-study be implemented?
3. Is there need for a Wisconsin Plan to
   a. Influence the distribution of the tax dollar?
   b. Determine certification policies for those entering the profession?
   c. Determine the role of each School of Education in the newly merged system?
4. How can articulation between universities and classroom teachers be improved and strengthened? How can Schools of Education most effectively adapt to new relationships with all other levels of educators and of education? What are the future roles of Schools of Education in public education systems in terms of professional responsibility?
5. What is the future role of practitioners of the public schools in the teacher education programs within the university system? How will decisions be made?
6. What types of teacher education admission policies, field experience programs, and exit procedures are most appropriate for future education?
7. How can the dicotomy of open admission or quota systems in teacher education (selection and certification) be resolved?

A transcription of the panel discussion follows:

Panel Discussion*

Bowman: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We have a forecast this morning that the snow will stop about noontime, the clouds will clear, and the roads will be safe for travel. Anyone who leaves before the panel concludes does so at some risk!

I told Mrs. Williams, our moderator, that I would provide the introductions of the panelists this morning thus relieving her of that particular responsibility. We had a rather provocative session last evening after the banquet. This group talked about the concerns that they have. More fine discussion took place at breakfast this morning.

We would like the dialogue this morning to be full and rich. We hope the panel will conduct a free-wheeling discussion. Later on perhaps our moderator will hold an open forum session in which the audience may participate.

I will introduce our panelists alphabetically, leaving the moderator until last.

Dr. Martin Haberman is Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. He has developed innovative programs in education at Columbia University, at Rutgers University, and most notably in Milwaukee. His many writings, speeches, and contributions are always provocative because they are a reflection of an educator who has experimentally demonstrated that teacher education can be changed and can be made more responsive to the needs of students, of the community, and of the profession.

Dr. Rolf Larson is a native Wisconsin educator. Incidentally, Perry Tipler who is in our audience and a member of our Citizens Advisory Council, retired now, but formerly superintendent of schools in the city of Oshkosh, was Dr. Larson's first boss. Dr. Larson has moved from Wisconsin to a position of national importance as executive director of the National Council for the Accreditation of

*Editor's Note:

Every effort has been made to record the following discussion accurately. However, it is possible that certain passages could be miscredited, because of an error in identifying a voice from the recording tape. In two instances names of people asking questions from the audience were not identifiable. Two sections of the original tape have not been transcribed because of interfering sounds and/or other difficulties in understanding the words.

Teacher Education. In this role he has made significant contributions in improving and modifying the standards with far-reaching impact upon the quality of teacher education from coast to coast.

John McDonnell is field consultant in higher education with the Wisconsin Education Association. He not only is an official representative of the W.E.A. to this conference, but he has a rich background of professional experiences as an education professor and chairman of the Department of Education at one of our fine private colleges, Beloit.

Dr. Allen Quick is director of student teaching at Central Michigan University. He has an excellent background of public school and university experience from one of our neighboring states. He can look at us from a different vantage point. He is also the brother of Dr. Donald Quick of the School of Education here at Oshkosh.

Lond Rodman is director of the Bureau of Teacher Education Certification of the Department of Public Instruction. In this capacity he has had the opportunity of working closely with all teacher education institutions in the State of Wisconsin. The involvement of the D.P.I. in the inner machinations of institutional development of teacher education has been greatly increased since the advent of the D.P.I. teacher education program review and campus visitation program that is being conducted every four years. This program began under the leadership of his predecessor and our next panelist to be introduced.

Dr. Allen Slagle, former public school teacher and administrator and D.P.I. director of teacher education certification is the former head of teacher education for the Wisconsin State University system. Now in the newly merged university system, Dr. Slagle is in the Chapter 37 institution as Head of Academic Affairs.

Jim Stoltenberg, last but certainly not least, is executive secretary of the Wisconsin Improvement Program, director of the office of Clinical Experiences for Teachers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He combines a background

of experience in the public schools with many years of active leadership in teacher education. He has also offered financial assistance to me from the good offices of the Wisconsin Improvement Program if we go too far into the hole on this conference. We certainly appreciate that noble gesture, Jim!

One of our panelists, Superintendent John Fochs of Wauwatosa, could not be here today.

Our charming moderator, Mrs. Robert Williams, was a member of the Wisconsin State University Board of Regents and is now of the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents and a member of the education committee of the Board. She has always been quick to support sound innovative developments in teacher education.

In case you students who are present wonder about student representation on the panel, we do have this. Mrs. Williams is also a student, presently enrolled in student teaching at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. She is also the wife of a public relations man and a mother. So our moderator has a broad experience to bring to us.

At this point I will turn the panel over to you, Mrs. Williams; and we will follow your lead from here.

Williams: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The charge to the panel is to start as lively a discussion as possible, showing that they are warm on the inside, although it is cold and snowing outside!

We had a chance to talk following Dr. Massanari's address last night and reflected on some of the things he brought to us. We also discussed some of the things that these gentlemen are concerned about pertaining to teacher education. Their decision is to have a general discussion of important issues this morning, rather than to make individual presentations.

One of the questions which this panel group would like to ask is not "What is the possible future direction for teacher education?" but rather "IS THERE

A FUTURE for teacher education?" We should consider the directions which teacher education in Wisconsin might take.

Haberman: What is likely to happen if people on the board of regents or in the state legislature decide to start making decisions as intelligent lay people regarding the future of teacher education in Wisconsin? There is great need for cohesiveness among educators of the state to withstand the pressure which would result.

Legislators will use geographic distribution and cost analysis figures of how much it costs to prepare a particular teacher in a particular institution, and employment figures to make decisions about our future. They will determine who is doing the best job in teacher preparation. On the basis of computer figures it is possible to know how many teachers are being placed, . . at what cost, and in what geographic areas. This is a hard-headed businessman's efficiency approach to the professional problems of education.

There is a great need for specific concepts about what we are to do. There are four kinds of ways we can decide to come up with a cohesive plan and answers regarding the future of teacher education in Wisconsin.

(1) We can get out of teacher education entirely, since it is not a function of academia, and turn the task over to renewal centers, saying "We will prepare people with bachelor degrees and let the renewal centers pick up people for field work (in education)". (2) We can go back to the ways of the '30's, dividing up the campuses for specialty areas such as art, music and science. We could try to divide up the campuses and relive the depression in better cars. (3) We could say that we are all in one big professional program - one big program in liberal studies or general education and work out an interlocking system in the state with students transferring at will. (4) We could come up with a cohesive imaginative plan for the '70's and '80's so that various campuses can have programs with

diversified emphasis. Different campuses will emphasize different missions without returning to the old subject-matter lines. I support this plan.

In order to do this we need a self-study year (at an expenditure of) $5000 per campus. This would be during September to June of next year, with the professional staffs of the system doing our own Wisconsin self-study. Each institution would have representatives, and the Wisconsin Educational Association would have representation. A report (should be given) to the Board of Regents on June 1 of a plan for each School of Education.

The W.E.A. should have equal numbers; the trend of the future is for the teachers to shoulder their professional responsibility in the preparation of teachers. Their professional responsibility is in helping to make decisions about what future teachers will study. The important role has shifted from the state superintendent's association (or department) to the W.E.A. representation. I see a heavy involvement of school teachers.

In the state of Washington they have a law requiring the involvement of professional and school organizations in teacher education programs. It is no longer the private domain of college professors. It is a trend we should support rather than worry about.

Larson: As I travel around the country, I hear whispers of what might be a fifth suggestion. Going back far enough in this cycle, as we do in education, you know that teacher education institutions were separate thirty or forty or fifty years ago. We made a strong move to join the academic community. Many say that we have been stolen blind in that academic community, that we don't have a professional program, that we are out-voted by liberal arts people who are anti-education. Some are suggesting that the way to get back to real professionalism is to allow our students to have a four-year liberal arts degree. It would be "pre-education" rather than "pre-medical". The students then would go to a professional training on top of four years of liberal arts education, and whereas I do not like it as

well as being a respectable part of the academic community, I think it is a fifth alternative. This would be a professional school, separate from the liberal arts school and on top of the general education program.

Williams: Are you thinking of this as being a possibility for every teacher education institution?

Larson: I am not thinking of it as a possibility at all, but it is being talked about. There would be selective schools of education, scattered strategically around the state of Wisconsin. These six, eight, or ten centers would take the products of the four-year liberal arts programs and in a professional year would turn them into teachers.

Slagle: We may not be as far from suiting the action to the world on alternative #4 proposition as it may seem. The Board of Regents' moratorium on the adoption of new programs until July 1, 1973, is a case in point. Prior to this date each campus will review and rewrite its mission statement. From the point of view of the Board of Regents this probably will take the form of some organization for the review of missions from the central administration. This provides opportunity for each university to make preparations prior to July, 1973. It is necessary and important to involve all sectors of a campus in this process--community, faculty, students--in bargaining for the university's mission before the Board. This time period could provide a vehicle for putting into operation Proposition #4.

Williams: Were any of these alternatives talked about in the state of Michigan, Dr. Quick?

Quick: In Michigan we have a group called Deans and Directors that meets once a month. They have done much for higher education and have brought us together to talk about our problems. It has developed into a consortium-type of arrangement and has prevented overlapping and duplication of programs. It has enhanced reciprocal arrangements in student teaching.

In Michigan the calendar arrangement of the various campuses has been coordinated, resulting in a more common calendar. A common evaluation form for use in student teaching has also been developed. Several universities in the state use the same schools and supervisory teachers. Having a common form of evaluation has helped to eliminate some confusion.

Another result has been in the method of payment to the supervising teachers. Recently this has been simplified, with a saving of funds. A study group had felt that only a small amount of money should be exchanged between the public schools and the university. The student teachers make a positive contribution to the public schools, and the supervisory teachers make contributions to the profession. Children within the school district benefit greatly from having a student teacher in the classroom.

We in Michigan also see a very real need for greater cooperative endeavor in teacher education with the practitioners, between the public schools and the universities in the preparation of teachers. If we do not do this, one of two things seems to be inevitable: (1) we will be legislated out of the business, and what Marty said will happen: the renewal center approach will be used. Or (2) the public schools will take over the teacher education program entirely.

In Michigan we were not far removed from that. At a representative assembly meeting with the Michigan Education Association, they voted that unless within a three-year period, the universities and public schools established a continuous dialogue, there would be no more student teaching in the state of Michigan. This forced us into something that we probably should have initiated on our own. Good has come out of this. An honararium involved in student teaching is not as significant to the teachers as is their having a piece of the action. They can have an input in the selection of those who are entering the profession. It appears to me that what we have done in Michigan is good - - asking teachers to serve on teacher education councils.

The teacher education councils are all coordinated by faculty members from multi-universities. For instance, in one community which may serve and be served by student teachers from thirteen campuses, there will be thirteen teachers from the thirteen different institutions sitting on the council with representatives from the community. They deliberate about what kind of teacher education program a preprofessional should have. These people are on the campuses regularly and have an input.

We feel that if we don't listen to the practitioners, we are out of the business. We have a cooperative teacher education program. We do not feel we have a program that we are giving away to public schools; the issue is that no longer can the teacher education program be lodged on the campus without close cooperation of public school people. I am convinced that this is the direction in which teacher education in the United States will go.

Rodman: Although we do not have the legislation of Washington nor the statewide design of the state of Michigan, in Wisconsin there has been a growing practice of a real parity-type of involvement with the public schools. It seems to me that during the past two years, I have seen a significant growth in this direction. I could not name a single campus in the state, private or public, where we do not have at least initial thrust in the direction of involvement of school districts in a true partnership arrangement.

I would like to comment, too, on the moratorium and the possible study and planning period for the institutions. I hope that during this time a study of missions and of evaluation that a great deal of attention will be given to NEW directions in teacher education and not just a dividing up of the programs that exist on the various campuses.

McDonnell: I am going to have to disagree with you somewhat when you talk about participation of public schools in teacher education. I'm not sure who you mean. Very often participation is at an administrative level, and teachers usually are

involved only when they are told to have a participating student teacher. If this were not true, I do not know why teachers are negotiating into contracts that force them to include student teachers. I think much of the cooperation going on now involves public school administrators rather than teachers. I don't think the public school teachers in this state are anywhere near taking the steps used in Michigan. That was almost a revolt of the grass roots public school teachers, but they are interested in participation.

N.E.A. and some of the teachers in W.E.A. are putting on some pressure to participate in NCATE teams where they actually are part of these teams. They then would get some idea of what evaluation involves. I do not think the teachers want to control teacher education totally, but they want to be involved. I think the real danger is that if we continue to have very little articulation between universities and classroom teachers without their actual participation, there will be so much alienation of practitioners from teacher education that the teachers will then seek to take action. This action could be either through legal or negotiation means. I do not feel, however, we are at this point yet.

Rodman: Teacher education councils are not strange to campuses in Wisconsin. They do have classroom teachers among their members. They have significant input into curriculum design, and relationships and selection of cooperating teachers. The relationships established with these teachers were (probably) not established through the W.E.A.

Stoltenberg: I think there is considerable evidence that parity is with us. Resolutions are being developed by the professional associations so they may have a piece of the action in decision-making matters. They are holding clinics on the role they should play in terms of teacher education. I think it really is imperative for those of us in institutions to be ready to deal effectively with this circumstance. The ability to get away from always reacting to pressure and reacting to decisions in an uncomfortable sense should be considered. The movement

of our partners, the public school teachers, toward becoming more involved in decision-making is something we should take a very close look at and try to deal with effectively.

Larson: As an example of testing the metal of teachers these days: this is showdown week in the state of Maine. The public school teachers, through their executive secretary, have served notice on the university system of the state (it is also merged) that they will start boycotting the courses offered by the colleges and universities unless university representatives give them (the teachers) a voice in decisions on what courses will be offered. Teachers are determined to get into the act and to help determine the program.

Williams: Mr. McDonnell, would you respond to this? What part of the action would the teachers in Wisconsin like to have in program initiating?

McDonnell: There is some talk about W.E.A., through the Council on Education, doing the evaluation of the teacher education institutions rather than NCATE. I think what U.W.-Milwaukee is doing is a fine procedure. The teacher education council such as at River Falls is a step in the right direction, but I'm not sure it goes far enough. As long as the teachers and the higher education faculty representatives must both teach full time and then do the teacher education council role besides, it does not really get at the heart and soul of the matter, although it is a good start. Marty, why don't you tell us something about your program there.

Haberman: I do not want just to tell about the program. We do have eleven joint appointments from the Milwaukee public schools that are classroom teachers whom we pay to supervise our student teachers. But more broadly than that are the different points at which we want practitioners involved. Examples are:

in the conception and development of programs
in credit values for courses
in program decisions
in evaluation of programs
in specific decisions of who we select into our programs. (Now it is often a clerical function of some admissions office.)

There should be some joint faculty-practitioner decision on who we select to prepare for teaching. There should be a similar decision-making partnership concerning who is selected to be prepared and who is certified. The base of involvement must be broadened to include faculty and practitioners.

Rather than spending additional time on this question, I prefer to hit hard on this idea of a year of self-study during the year of program moratorium for the university system. Meetings like this can be good as starters, but they can be poison if we assume that any procedure gets accomplished. Meetings do not result in decision-making machinery being established. What we need is a year of self-study and solid planning to prevent the show-down type of reaction that happened in Michigan and in Maine. We must get ahead of the game and present the regents with what we propose by way of a joint arrangement. That is why I think it is so important that we take next year to do it.

Williams: Are you talking about a broad-based study in which the teaching profession will also make recommendations about the financing of public education as well as of teacher education?

Haberman: Yes. I think as we move to state support and away from local property tax, we will not only be competing among ourselves for the dollar but also with the public schools for the same funds. We will now ALL be competing for a finite amount of money. It is a competitive dollar between us and the local high school district or the local elementary school district. As we move away from local property taxes, we must make decisions. Will we present some cogent plan? Will we sit and think about it, come to meetings, hear a brilliant paper, or will we actually invest some money and come up with a plan that initiates an idea and a rationale for the use of the tax dollar?

Slagle: We have had the observation that the matter of the acceptance of student teachers is entering into the negotiations carried on by organized teachers with their boards of education. I presume that we are talking about master contracts

and that sort of thing? What would you think of the idea of encouraging teacher preparation institutions to enter into collective bargaining with faculty in public school systems about this question? A significant part of all of our teacher education programs, especially secondary education programs, in terms of credit hours awarded, is taken up with the student teaching component. It would seem to me that in this kind of a forum there would be opportunities for faculties in the schools to make felt their desires and their insistances about the entry of people into teacher education.

It could be that if we took the initiative in this respect, we could obviate the necessity of this coming up in a collective bargaining situation which would be contaminated by so many other considerations . . . especially money.

Williams: This goes along with another matter discussed briefly last night: who should have a part in making decisions? Do you think that this is part of what you are suggesting. . . that there must be changes in who will participate in decision-making?

Slagle: I guess this is what I am suggesting when I ask what you think of the idea. I am not ready to go out and fight for the idea yet, but it has occurred to me.

Stoltenberg: I think it is a very positive idea; however, the structure of negotiations at the present time is between the representatives of the association and the board of education. The key to entering into that arena is somewhat blurred because institutions find themselves on the outside looking in. If it could be approached, it could have some success. I think in the present structure of negotiations it would be very difficult to deal with. Boards of education, in my judgment, are not going to sit by and be oblivious to what conditions and what circumstances are negotiated by teachers' associations with institutions of higher learning. I think that is a reality that would exist!

Williams: Do you have a reaction to that Mr. McDonnell?

McDonnell: I don't think we are ready to go into collective bargaining. I think bargaining is a useful tool but not one that should be used immediately. I certainly

do not think that we are at the stage in this state of needing to negotiate with institutions of higher learning over the conditions of teacher education. I guess I still consider educators, kindergarten through university, as professionals; and I believe it is possible to work together. Teachers don't claim to know all that there is to know about the teaching-learning process. They are honestly looking for help, but they also feel they should have some input. . . and they do have some good ideas. If there is growth in alienation, which I mentioned earlier, I think you could have this happening. You people in teacher education know that in summer, Universities are kept open by the Schools of Education. You would close down River Falls or Oshkosh or Whitewater if there were no teachers there and if you did not provide the courses for the teachers. So you are a rather important part from the standpoint of the university.

Williams: You have mentioned several pressures that are going to form the basis for initiation ahead of the time when reaction must come. One of those pressures is increasing the desire for participation by the practitioners and the financial considerations involved. What is your reaction to the issue of limiting the enrollment in Schools of Education? This may be one of the things which the public will ask. . .when looking at the possibilities for employment in the field, and also at the money being spent in that kind of education.

Slagle: At the present time almost anyone who goes to college goes for vocational orientation. In a sense we are all vocational schools with a small fee. I, for one, will not advocate that we limit the number of people going into teacher education. It does not bother me particularly that if there should be an over-supply of nurses that a person who might want to prepare for nursing would take a spot as long as these spots are available. I think this is a concept that we are going to need to defend, however. Teacher education is an excellent preparation for adulthood, if college education is also good preparation for adulthood. I do not especially defend the position of picking up the necessary eighteen credits just to have it in case of wanting to teach. However, I see this as an excellent way of selecting

broad-based, humanizing courses. We have responsibility in teacher education to promote this idea.

Also we are hearing that in certain fields, boards of education, for economic reasons, are talking about eliminating certain kinds of professionals from their staffs because they are dispensable. Guidance counselors are an example. Taking this as an illustration, I feel that if we are preparing these people for positions and the market is not available because of economic reasons, we have an obligation to persuade the boards of education of what the disadvantages would be in not having guidance counselors. If we are not willing to do this, I am suggesting that we should be willing to get out of the business of preparing people for jobs that do not exist.

Rodman: I would like to respond to part of that. I agree that the education received by a person pursuing a teaching preparatory program is probably superior to the general Letters and Science program. But I do feel that the numbers coming out into the market because of NO limitation in numbers coming into the program does or can have an undesirable effect on the quality of teaching in the elementary and secondary schools.

Slagle: Don't you think, though, that when we have a greater selection that the boards of education can be more selective than they have in the past? I think that one thing that would be of interest to know is that in 1971, 70% of the people completing teacher education in Wisconsin are now employed.

Rodman: I don't think we have the criteria needed for selecting teacher education candidates of quality. That is one of our problems.

Williams: Has there been any discussion in Michigan about curtailing the number of people entering programs of teacher education?

Quick: Very much so. The University of Michigan has put a quota on the number of people being admitted to the School of Education. We have an over-supply of teachers in Michigan, but I think it is based on economics, as it is everywhere.

We especially have an over-supply in secondary education social studies, men's physical education, and English.

I think we at Central Michigan University are involved in a very difficult situation concerning numbers. This year we anticipated 1800 student teachers, whereas we had 2300. This causes problems. I don't mind having open admission to teacher education programs. I believe that it is a quality program and there is no better preparation for citizenship. I am concerned, however, that you cannot operate a quality program with open admission unless you have the financial backing.

This is a problem; the money is not following the students. Unless the money does follow the students, we do not intend to have open admission policies. The situation recently has changed. Five years ago I was harassed by superintendents to waive the student teaching requirement because teachers were desperately needed. Now it is the superintendents and the practitioners who want the colleges to establish better criteria for admission into teacher education. They say that we have the doors wide open. We have had a complete change. We plan to do something, but we will not do something if the money follows. We will admit everyone into teacher education and have the "exit" requirements as the real specific criteria. Unless the money follows the students, our admission policy will change and become much more stringent.

Slagle: I think that exit requirements should be THE requirement. . .not entering. I suppose that I did tend to emphasize that. As Dr. Massanari said last night, it is a matter of who we actually license to become a teacher that is the critical question.

Quick: I go back to the economics question. If we are to have equality teachers, we must have finances to do this job. It is impossible to have a methods class of sixty to seventy or a practicum group of forty to fifty students assigned to a particular teacher or supervisor. Without finances, we cannot have a quality program.

McDonnell: I agree with that, and I would add that to know whether or not a person can teach is not a simple process, and you do not teach it in eighteen semester hours. If you go P.B.T.E. (Performance-Based Teacher Education) the best thing that would come out of it would he to sit down and outline the competencies which it takes to be a good teacher. . .the person who is broadly and liberally educated; who knows how to teach, has had considerable experience in the classroom, and who has some theory of sociology of education, philosophy, and psychology. Some people can do this in a few years, but this is not possible for very many. It took me three years out in the field to become a decent high school teacher; and there are some teachers in the field who are not really qualified. It is not that they are not capable; they simply have not had the necessary experiences.

So there is the problem of teaching loads that Allen is talking about; but there is also this one: the length of time that we deal with the actual process of teaching learning. I suppose part of this would be the amount of time in the classroom.

Jim, I don't know what I can say about the W.I.P. (Wisconsin Improvement Program) task force. Do I dare say anything or not?

Stoltenberg: Say as much as you like, John.

McDonnell: One of the things they are talking about is not a fifth year program but a post baccalaureate, full year internship. This makes a lot of sense to me. It's much better than the normal fifth year program such as I underwent at UCLA in California where the fifth year was a 200 to 300 group lecture. I don't think that is really too valuable. A second part of the W.I.P. task force report is that the teacher is not certified until the end of this internship. Then certification is done cooperatively by the classroom teaching group and by the teacher training institution. This makes some sense to me.

Haberman: I don't see how we can justify open enrollment, saying that teacher education is good for everybody, unless the certificate is dropped. You can take

the position that teacher education is good general education for everybody. That can be defended logically, provided you drop the certificate from it. If you include the certificate it becomes professional education, and you have to justify it as training in the performance of service to children and youth. If you continue to permit open enrollment, you are in the position of having to convince the regents why you want EXPANDING facilities. As Allen pointed out, the general feeling of most people who go to college is that they are preparing for some job or work. We have data on this. Even though there are no jobs in teaching, they will choose teaching over other things, because other things are not promising either.

So what we are advocating, gentlemen, is to develop a plan by which we would go to regents and ask for an EXPANSION of our services. I don't think that regents will buy the stuff I have been hearing in the last five minutes. It is not only snowing outside; it's starting to snow inside!

I would advocate that if we want to do anything of a serious nature we must plan next year, formulating a cohesive Wisconsin Teacher Education Plan which can include what Allen is saying about general education without a certificate. It can include a lot of things that are being said, but it should be some cohesive plan that shrinks the total fiscal support for it. . .not one which expands it.

Secondly, we often talk about law and the rights of students. Unless we come up with a Wisconsin plan I am personally going to advise students to sue us! Right now there is no reason for a quota to be set up in the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee or Madison if that same student could afford to go to Oshkosh into an open enrollment. If Oshkosh will take anybody who can breathe and sign a non-communist affidavit but Madison and Milwaukee will set up a quota, that means we are denying our citizens equal access to educational opportunities, merely because they can not afford to travel sixty or eighty miles from home.

As a hypothetical example, consider a poor Polish girl who can attend only part time because she is supporting a family. We set up a quota, and Oshkosh goes along expanding because they take the position that open enrollment is great or

Haberman: Let me say just one more thing, Mary. I think the answer to the selection process is that selection is a process, not an event. Selection is not a test or an interview; selection is what we usually call our four-year program. In other words, at the end of the typical teacher education program in this state, we know who should be prepared for teaching. If we regarded our whole program as selection and then set the quota for a very small number, we could go on at very small expense, regarding it as general education. We could have 300 people in a lecture hall listening to educational psychology lectures or anything else. The expensive part of teacher education is the professional part of the training or field part, the actual certification part. The general education component of teacher education is the cheap part in which we can compete with the historians and the English faculty on academic and class lines. If we reserve the professional part for the proposals for money, we can limit to maybe one out of thirty that we now prepare, but permit open access to anyone who wants it, regarding it as general education. My hangup is to reward with a certificate of life service somebody who wants general education.

Rodman: I think, Marty, your concern about this open admission could pretty well be accomplished if we are willing to remove what really amounts to a kind of automatic certification. This is what happens in law schools, for instance. The great American dream says that anybody who can get into law school can study law; but this does not necessarily mean that each person is going to be licensed to practice. I think that this might well be the path we have to go. Then again, this brings it back to performance-based criteria. I guess I wonder who cares whether the person has had student teaching if he can demonstrate to those of us who make a judgement that he can teach.

Haberman: I happen to like the law model better than the others, but if we go with that exit bit, then we must have state exams. We can't expect the particular faculty to screen their own people. Our history in teacher education is that we

because it is good general education for everybody. Then we would be denying equal access to educational opportunities. We must get together and come up with one unified selection (of process). If there are good selection procedures for teachers, those selection procedures hold in Madison and they hold in Oshkosh. Those good selection procedures for a professional do not change because you travel sixty miles away.

We must come up with the answers. We can't just say, "Well, change is better and easier to accomplish if we don't unify." That is correct, but you don't hear other professional schools argue. It just does not make any sense not to get together and come up with a Wisconsin plan. To merely talk about exit procedures does not take any account of the data.

Teachers, professors, and supervisors do not fail students. To talk about exit procedures implies that we are going to admit averybody and then screen (later). If we admit everybody, we will graduate everybody. So that if we are going to engage in any kind of cutback, it must be in the selection. An intelligent program involves five or six points of self-and external-selection. What you are advocating is for us to come with a proposal to Mrs. Williams and her colleagues for expansion. It is a creative idea, but (it is not what is needed.)

Williams: Another aspect of this is the financing of students in public higher education based on numbers. The formula that is used is that the number of students enrolled bring a certain number of dollars. I know it is questioned constantly by educators whether this is indeed the way education should be financed. It is the numbers approach. It seems to me that you people in this professional field should be able to come up with some alternatives to the numbers approach if you are going to be talking about increased quality or answering these questions about an open admissions policy. All of these kinds of things are going to have to be associated with alternative approaches in financing. Do you have any comments about that?

fall in love with the students, give them all A's and guarded references. Our history in teacher education does not indicate that we are capable of any kind of exit procedures. So the law model is good, but you know they have state bars. They do not have individual professors stamping people "O.K." They use the state approach. . .so if you fall in love with students, that does not guarantee the students that because they can con you, they can get a certificate.

Slagle: Yes, I suppose there is not a Dean of Education who has been in the business more than a couple of years who hasn't run into some kind of situation where his faculty are saying "How did we ever let him get this far? What are we going to do about him?" Then in eight cases out of ten he probably goes right on into the profession.

Haberman: We can't even fail doctoral students!

Williams: Well, with the increased demand for accountability and the way in which in practice the period of probation works (or does not work, as I understand it), there needs to be some decision on whether indeed, when the institution says a student is certifed as a teacher, this is true. Then that meaning is understood to anyone who chooses to hire that individual. As I understand it, the day a person is hired to teach in Wisconsin, generally that means that there is no period of probation.

* * * * * * *

Williams: I think we will accept comments or questions from the audience at this time and continue with questions among the panel members. Please identify yourselves when you ask a question.

Weisse: I am Ed Weisse of Oshkosh. I really want to direct this to Dr. Larson, Dr. Rodman, and to Dr. Slagle who represent the NCATE, the Department of Public Instruction, and the Board of Regents. The reason I want to stress this is that I often hear you people referred to as some kind of monster out there that lived in the past who knows how genius takes place . . . because you've got your standards to live up to. I don't believe that, but I want to hear it from you people.

Rodman: I don't know what you mean by the "monster out there." Are you referring to the institutions?

Weisse: What I'm trying to say is that if we want to make changes in a pattern of certification for teachers, we can't do that because the DPI has certain kinds of regulations. We only have one accepted program and can't get anything else accepted. "That's your program and you're stuck with it" . . . and we have to live with it. Or we hear "You can't do that because it isn't in line with NCATE" or "We can't do that because the Board of Regents won't accept that." Only I am never allowed as a faculty member to appear before you people.

Rodman: I would submit that I believe that the Department of Public Instruction has few very rigid regulations with respect to teacher preparation programs. We operate on what we call the approved program principle or plan. This permits the institution to develop a program as it sees it should be developed, and then it is submitted to us. I think most of the people in the audience that have done so would find that we are quite flexible as far as approving programs. We do not mandate programs from our office except within a very broad context of a minimum of thirty-four hours for a major, for example. I think we have actually three requirements of courses in the professional program. Beyond that it is pretty much up to the institution to design its own program. We look to the institutions to have different

kinds of programs even in the same area. We don't want a program for the preparation of teachers of English to be the same at Oshkosh as we do at Stevens Point. We look for a variety of ways of producing good teachers.

Larson: There have been great changes in recent years that have removed much of the monster-likeness from the old NASDEC organization (the National Association of State Directors in Teacher Education and Certification.) But I have been at it long enough, and I know I am a monster, and I'll admit it.

Accreditation is an American invention. It is one of two basic American inventions in education. The other is the local school board. Obviously, because of its definition, accreditation cannot operate at the cutting edge of innovation. It is a very ticklish proposition. It must operate somewhere back of the cutting edge, which might be too far out, and yet not so far back from the cutting edge that it is reactionary or ultra-conservative. The task of finding just where to operate so the accreditation is sufficiently inhibiting and efficient as a quality-producing agent without being a deterrent is a difficult thing to do. The standards under which we operated in 1960 got out of date; and the more we got out of date, the more we fell back from that theoretical good position, back from the front a little way. Hopefully, the new standards which are dated 1970 will bring us back up so we gain a little distance. There is no question at all that my twenty-two bosses want innovation, creativity, flexibility and good movement. There is no question at all that the ten blue ribbon people who have written these last standards for us intended exactly the same thing. There is no question that hundreds and thousands of people like Dave Bowman and the rest of you support the same idea.

The task of operating an accrediting agency is something else again. When a council or an evaluating group sit in a smoke-filled room and make a decision about Oshkosh or another institution, they may not find the exact spot . . . the one which is sufficiently inhibiting without being over-inhibiting. It is a delicate proposition, and I must admit very candidly that I have sometimes fallen

a little back. The tendency is to fall backwards a little bit and then to fall forward a little bit.

If and when it can be demonstrated that the inhibiting effect of accreditation outweighs the good it produces, we should get out of the business overnight. There is no question about that in my mind. At the present time the council tries periodically to look at what it is accomplishing, what has happened as a result of the accreditation. They are convinced that the suffering that comes about from the partial degree of inhibition at this point is outweighed by the good which has been accomplished. So you see it is never a firm position; it is always comme ci comme ca. You are floating, and you are trying to do what is right, and you are trying to encourage evaluation.

There is one thing which bothers me considerably. I just shudder to hear a dean saying, "We've got a new program ready to go into operation; but NCATE is coming next year. We're going to wait and not rock the boat." I hate to see this; but of course, I cannot make the dean's decisions for him; he is playing it safe. This is one of the detractions of accreditation. It exists and we must recognize it.

Many an institution might have put into the curriculum something new and creative a year earlier, but they wanted to play it safe. There is a reluctance to risk the disapproval of someone on one of the accreditation boards who has a conservative point of view or is not up-to-date and would dock the school for some points.

We must always be alert to the point when the bad begins to outweigh the good. At that point you and we together must just sink this boat . . . get (the accrediting agency) out of existence. However, at the present I think the council members are still pretty well convinced that they are operating on the right side of the ledger. There are some other things on the other side of the ledger, too.

Slagle: I think you have put your finger on something characterizing our business at all levels. Those people who are in the ranks commonly perceive that they are not able to be heard. We feel we cannot do things because the people upstairs will not let us. I have found at the public school and university levels that frequently people who make such statements have not really made the effort. There are occasions that they find when they do make the effort that there is no opposition: they get what they want. There are others who, finding out that they could get what they were asking, decide suddenly that they did not want it in the first place. Then they must find another excuse for not doing whatever is was they said they could not do in the first place.

Larson: I agree with you one hundred percent. There is a folklore that has grown up around this; it just simply does not exist. There are not nearly as many deterrents for this problem as the folklore says there are. So go ahead (with your ideas).

Kean: I am Jack Kean from Madison. I think Marty has some interesting ideas. But I am wondering who is in charge of teacher education in Wisconsin or in the University of Wisconsin?

Haberman: Nobody is.

Kean: There is no implementable kind of organ?

Haberman: That's right. It prevents any kind of accountability system.

Kean: An administrative council is great for meetings, but it is not (useful) for implementing something.

Haberman: Exactly! Wouldn't you say in another sentence or two exactly what you would like to see happen? "Therefore, what I think is . . ."

Kean: What I would like to see is for somebody at the board level to define a person who is called the Coordinator of Teacher Education and who is responsible.

Haberman: What we need is a Dean of Teacher Education for the State of Wisconsin.

Larson: Or something like that. If you think that the eighty people here at Oshkosh in the School of Education are going to make the decision about how much money is spent for teacher education, you are just dreaming. A few hard-headed businessmen or legislators or something of that sort are going to make the decision. It doesn't make any difference in the world how professional you are and what you believe and how high your ideals are and all the rest of it. You need those school teachers in partnership with you, and you need some other people in partnership with you. If anything these last tens years have told you is that if you do not have an organization and some cult, you are not going to get any place. This morning you did not say this about why we should get together, but it is one of the reasons for getting together with school teachers.

Voice from the Audience: (The following three paragraphs are paraphrased, as the tape was unclear.) How, very pragmatically, could we get Marty's recommendation for self-study off the ground at this meeting? I am a faculty member in the ranks, just a year and a half in the faculty of a large system. In such a position, you feel out of it; and I think this is the problem the classroom teacher in the public school may feel. You feel lonely and powerless, which may not be true. But our perceptions are more important that the truth at times.

Last night I sat as a non-participant listening to members of this panel discuss the proceedings for today. I had the feeling that somehow these major decisions in teacher education in Wisconsin are going to be made, not necessarily by this group, but by some group like that sitting over a drink some Friday night - that programs will be distributed in this way.

I would like some representation as a faculty through the university, and my question comes back to how we can get Dr. Haberman's recommendations off the ground here. Do we have any voting power?

Bowman: This leads to one of the things which I hoped to say before we close today. If we really have some concensus that what Marty is saying makes sense, it is fortunate that we have one person on the panel who at least has the ear of the people who do have power. As Ed Weisse said, he can't go to the board; he can't go to NCATE; he can't very well go to the DPI. I can't either. I worked for a year an a half to get an appearance before the board with regard to what I thought was an exciting project and for which I needed $60,000. The only way that I got it was by the ear of Mrs. Robert Williams and some other regents. They opened up the doors for a hearing. At this point, I would like to suggest that if we do agree with Marty, maybe we can request our moderator to bring to President Weaver, Vice Presidence Haas, and the Council of Chancellors, this kind of a suggestion. It should be a tangible suggestion, that $5,000 be allocated off the top of our budget. This would be with a specific involvement of the teachers of the State of Wisconsin, through the WEA and classroom teachers group association, to have a year of self-study with specifics in this area. I do believe we have one person here who can reach the people with power. Maybe you want to pursue this some more. I don't mean to put you on the spot, Mrs. Williams, but would you react to the suggestions being repeated here and to the potential that you would have to bring this matter to a group that could either say "We like it" or "Have them go ahead and try it?"

Williams: Well, I think that the members of the Board of Regents would welcome the initiation of self-study which would bring specific recommendations to them. I do think that what you say about including the professionals from the Department of Public Instruction, the classroom teachers, the whole broad spectrum of people who are involved in the profession of public education in Wisconsin may end up being a budget recommendation from the board to the legislature. Then it will be a legislative decision. But what is needed is much more input to the whole study than simply the professionals in the schools. I really urge you to get as broad a view as possible, involving people who are doing the work and who are involved

in making decisions. Then when recommendations do come to the board they will have all the justifications and some of the answers to questions that they will want to ask.

Haberman: Let me predict something. If we do not make this proposal, two years from now a regent is going to advise the hiring of an out-of-state consultant firm, at five times the cost, to do a study that will not be anywhere nearly as informed as what we could do. We will end up reacting rather than initiating. If anything else, you give them a bargain price, Mary.

Williams: I think you have quite a bit of influence. Don't minimize the kind of influence you have when you are representatives from thirteen institutions asking to work on a self-study project and to make recommendations in regard to these issues. I think that is going to give it quite a bit of impetus right there.

Slagle: There are ways to get things done. You have illustrated this quite amply, Dave. I think also when we are talking about this effort, we should be sure that we take maximum advantage of the provisions that are now available to us. If we decide as a group of deans of education or as a group of education faculty that we should have some kind of special provision or something off the top for teacher education and are somehow able to convey that to the Board of Regents, I don't think we stand a very good chance if we go by ourselves. We must persuade some other people on the campuses . . . like chancellors, people in academic departments, and so on. Now in an organization the size of ours, because of its size, there are certain bureaucratic restraints. Obviously, no matter how often the Board of Regents meet, they cannot hear every individual who might say, "I'd like to be heard by the regents." On the other hand, many people are heard by the regents - especially people who represent things that are recognized as vital concerns. To wit: minority group studies, student disciplinary matters. There is not a Board of Regents meeting that passes but there is a place on the agenda for representatives of the student governments, the organized faculties, the chancellors.

If we as education deans want to obtain something in the Schools of Education throughout the system, if we cannot do some legislation ourselves and make the proposal ourselves to the regents, we can each program our own administrators, our own chancellors. They have the opportunity to go to the regents and say, "This is what we propose." The regents like that, because this helps them establish priorities.

There are other groups besides teacher education having the same concerns. I do not disagree with the movement that seems to be getting generated here, but I think I would not have the temerity to say I wanted to give a charge to a member of the Board of Regents that would do this. *

Haberman: I have the proposal resolutions of the Wisconsin Education Association before me, and I think it would be appropriate to read this in view of what you said. "The Wisconsin Education Association is aware of the tremendous impact which the merger of the University of Wisconsin-State University System will have on the teacher education programs as well as on the teaching profession. The Association, therefore, shall take a leadership role in determining the direction of teacher education programs by seeking WEA approved representation on committees dealing with teacher training as affected by the merger."

The time is here, and this will be information that is disseminated to all professional groups and levels this fall or this spring. There are many others in the same context. I thought it would be appropriate to read them.

* Editor's Note:

A section at the end of the tape, including comments by Perry Tipler, is completely incoherent and cannot be interpreted.

Larson: There is no question about teacher militancy these days. One of the very fortunate contacts I have had through the years by virtue of being with the NCATE is that I am so-called consultant or liaison person with the TEPS commission. The TEPS Commission has now gone out of business, and we have a new council, CIPD. I hope someday I may meet with them as I once met with TEPS.

These national commissions represent a lot of teachers intending to get in on the act. The NEA is currently pouring money into a lot of states to get commissions which will take over the job of licensing, including the revoking of licenses, and take over the job now performed by the State Department of Education of recognizing which institutions within the state shall be allowed to prepare teachers. If they decide in this state that they are going to go after that, and if they get the legislature to pass it, (and they may by-pass the colleges and go right to the power of legislature in doing so) you may find a body of teachers telling Oshkosh whether or not to be in the businesss. They intend to exercise this power.

Every teacher I have seen in this context means to be in on the act. I looked last year into the baby-blue eyes of Helen Bain who was president of NEA; and I tell you it comes out clear and cold and sharp . . . and there is no monkeying around about it. Don Morrison is not that same kind of person. He seems more warm and more human, but he said the same thing. The teachers want in on this, and they are going to be in on it. They are not about to have college professors telling them what to do, when to do it, what to take, and all the rest of it. If these contacts of mine mean anything to you as college people in Wisconsin, I think you should start dealing them in, because they are going to be in the act without you, if they aren't in the act with you. This is how I interpret them. I may be wrong, but I see strong signs. This is what they intend to do, one way or the other.

Becker: I can believe all of that, and I'll buy some of the things Marty said, and maybe this business about "self-study" is an unfortunate choice of words. The idea is to develop a Wisconsin University System Plan for Teacher Education. There must be a systematic vehicle and channel by which somebody can get the things moving. I can't find out who the body is that will do this.

Weisse: I want to get back to the same point I was making awhile ago, because it sounds like a college professor is somehow making the decisions for teachers. The thing I'm saying is that I think college professors are powerful to make a decision about what teacher education should be. I think that to some extent we need to have freedom and flexibility to help teachers, especially those who are wanting to continue their growth as teachers. We need some kind of flexibility to design a program to help them become good teachers.

Dr. Slagle, I think I can point to several things that we have been trying to do since 1965 to get some freedom, but we have not been able to get these things going. Many times people of the board office have been accused of being people who say "no." I don't believe that, as I said: but I think the thing is that we have often said we can't do something because the Board of Regents said we couldn't.

Slagle: I appreciate your charity, but I think we can conceive the ways to bring to pass the type of thing you are desiring. One way is to have an advocate on the staff, as was the case before the merger in the Chapter Thirty, the WSU System. I would have to confess that I don't think it was especially effective, but the Board of Regents of that system some years ago decided that they wanted to have a member on their staff whose specialty was teacher education. This is how I came to it. The largest single thing we did in those institutions was to prepare teachers. That was a way of foreclosing on every other interest group having a similar person there. I am not advertising for a job; I just had to explain that is one way to do it.

Massanari: There has been some very interesting discussion this morning. I would like to underline the importance of the study idea that Marty proposed, but first I want to make some comments about one matter in a perfunctory way. This has to do with the involvement of the practitioners. It is clear that we are going to have practitioner involvement. When I say it that way, I have already indicated that it is defensive. It is clear that we have left them out for decades. They know it, and as was said last night, they now are in a so-called adversary position. It seems to me that we just have to admit and recognize the fact that we have left them out. Their perception now of our wanting their involvement and needing their involvement may be just as important as the involvement itself. I think you were talking about perception a minute ago. We want them in because they have a positive contribution to make, and I think we must try to undo some of the wrong of the past. So it is a question of how we are going to react to the reaction of practitioners. I think this is a rather important point. Back at the home shop we have a lot of defensiveness about involving practitioners. Yes, it is something we must do; if we do not we will be out of business. We look for resolutions. These are all defensive. I am suggesting that we need to assume a more positive attitude toward meeting this involvement. What the reaction of the practitioner will be to that kind of attitude I am not sure.

More importantly, I would like to underline the suggestion originated by Marty for the Wisconsin study that would lead to some kind of a Wisconsin plan for teacher education. I think that is a terribly important thing in Wisconsin. I would suggest that it is important to the nation; Wisconsin is one of the few states that have the merged system of higher education. Others include California and New York. There is a leadership need on the national level.

This suggests to me a couple of additional ideas that may be thrown into the hopper as supplements. One has to do with the possibility of some relationship through these other two or three states as a part of a study, looking at California,

New York and other states where these systems are in operation, having part of the study involve other states that are facing the same kind of problems as this state.

I was reporting last night on two new consortiums of states for other purposes, and it seems to me that this purpose, this function that you are talking about may be more important than some of those who promote PBTE. Perhaps some kind of small consortium of states in leadership roles might be considered.

The other supplementary idea emerged from what Alan way saying about the situation in Michigan and h's suggestion of the importance of continuation of people in teacher education in Wisconsin meeting in conferences on a bi-annual basis. I was thinking back to some of the kinds of activity in the State of Indiana where every year representatives assemble from both public and private institutions of higher education, as well as from state departments of teacher education, and to a much lesser extent, practitioners. If you are looking at teacher education, a plan for the State of Wisconsin should include the private and public sectors of education. I recognize the unique kind of problem you are dealing with respecting the merger of higher education public institutions and what that means; but there are the public and private sectors as well. These are two supplementary ideas.

I have no suggestions on the politics of bringing this about. I think the idea is terribly important. It would be a wonderful thing to do in Wisconsin.

Williams: Dr. Massanari, do you have any reactions to the comments that were made about the open enrollment and the careful scrutiny of candidates upon exit from teacher education programs, as it was mentioned as a possibility in the Schools of Education?

Massanari: I could get engaged in some continued discussions about that. I hesitate to do that because I fear it would get us off the track. What is very important at this time seems to be about the merger.

Olson: I am Jim Olson from Milwaukee. I would like to disagree with my colleague and the gentleman back there. (?Who?) After I learned a lesson from Dr. Slagle several years ago about how to function in a bureaucracy, I went to work within that bureaucracy. It seems to me that we are not at all powerless. Within my little shop in Milwaukee where I once programmed, I found there are ways you can get the program; people do listen. If you have an idea, people will talk. I think that his kind of an organization we are talking about here carries power, if we just try to use it.

McDonnell: I might react by saying that K-12 teachers once thought they were powerless also. After listening to you people, I don't think they are anymore. I think there is a tremendous community of interest between K-12 people and the university people. Listening to Ed Weisse for instance, I suspect that many of his feelings are not much different from those of the K-12 people. I have talked to both groups of people, and the ideas of what needs to be done in teacher education are not much different. The worries of the K-12 people is a grass roots type of thing, I guess. They are worried, and you are worried about similar things. It is a matter of getting together on the concerns. I agree with this gentleman from Milwaukee: you people are not powerless although you have thought yourselves powerless for a long time.

Olson: Jim, my main point was not that we are powerless, but that as faculty perceive that we are powerless. That is the point, and that is why I don't think it will get done.

Williams: Mr. Haberman, would you like to respond on some of the comments that have been made?

Haberman: In effect, by asking for self-study, I am asking for lambs to invent the lion. I recognize that. For me this is a victory of expectation over experience. I realize the history of the change business in which people in the bureaucratic or organizational roles do not tend to eliminate themselves. However, I think there

is every reason for optimism that we can do it for several reasons that have been mentioned at this table and yesterday.

It wouldn't be the old boys' club of former years; it will be an open plan which will be subject to public scrutiny. It wouldn't occur in the privacy of some committee room or some faculty room. It will have to be a plan that is printed, publicly distributed and publicly defended. Secondly, it will involve public school teachers, state department people, and hopefully, administrators and other interested groups so that it will not be the old boys' club. These factors give me hope.

There is a third reason. I think as rational beings, we recognize the very strong possibility that many of us may be put out of business, and whether we believe in general education or in performance based contracts, or whatever reasons we have for believing we should exist, this will spur us on to initiative. I am quite hopeful for these three reasons that although we are sheep and although we have in the past been powerless, we can exert some leadership.

We would be dealing with public documents. As far as the means for doing this, Karl, I think what you say is beautiful. Your last sentence that, "I don't know the politics of getting it done," leads me to say I think that it is our responsibility to keep struggling with that. There is lots of brainstorming and there are other creative ways that we could do this. The same initiative that Dave Bowman showed in getting us here to celebrate the 100th centennial could be applied. He could easily send a collect wire to the fourteen deans informing them that he was contributing "X" amount with a one page outline of what the study involved, and asking them when their checks would be in the mail. I think he would find the checks coming. To Jack Kean, my colleague, I say: this can be done. It can be done in this amorphous blob, this bureaucratic maze on which you can never get a handle of accountability or response. It can be done because that same maze creates a power vacuum. Once you get a movement going, it becomes just as difficult to stop as it is to initiate. Laws of bureaucratic inertia set in.

So it is a question of will power. Are there any people here willing to send the first wires? The same effort that went into setting up this centennial is required in organizing a self-study. I do not have a plan; I cannot be questioned right now on details, but I see it as a broadly based thing involving representatives of teacher education, the classroom teachers, the state departments, and all interested parties. I see it as a public document.

I see the effort as involving study beyond the state borders; I see it as including mission statements of the intentions of each of the campuses plus sight visitations by objective observers to give them external evaluations as well as their internal mission statement. I see very specific judgments coming out of this, and I think it is quite hopeful. There are lambs that do invent lions.

Williams: I have always been a believer in planning; therefore, it was disillusioning to me when I first learned about the history of the emphasis and different kinds of teacher education at the teacher colleges of the state universities. It is somewhat like dividing up the pot in a poker game: kindergarten education went to Superior, music went to Eau Claire, agriculture went to Platteville and River Falls. Originally, this probably was because there was some strength indicated in those areas, but also there was an arbitrary division. So it seems to me that out of the knowledge that we have accumulated about these things, there should be some additional advantage now in putting that knowledge to work and going on from here.

I have a question which I would like to ask those of you who are going to participate in such a study. Will you include questions about curriculum?

For example: are we really teaching the children in the state the things that they need to know in order to deal with the future? The comment was made yesterday that people teach the way they have been taught, and these ways are in the traditional disciplinary approach. Are these really adequate for the things that we need to know to deal with the world of the future? Should we be including in our curriculum

more interdisciplinary approaches, more ethnic studies, more studies for women? Are we in a bind in our traditional curriculum approach? I hope that you will include that in your study.

Betts: I am wondering about the para-professional. Why haven't we included in our educational department something about the people we have coming out now who are aware of the technology that we have going on in education? We haven't been mentioning any of these new things that I am sure the school of tomorrow will be dealing with. I think that we should all have a vision to see some of these things and broaden our school of education so that we just don't have our teachers as the principle motivation but we also include some of these other people who will be working in our school. They will be part of our professional group. They are there now, and we are allowing our technical schools to train them. We have sort of just dropped it. I think if we are going to survive that we should do something with the paraprofessionals and with technology.

Williams: We might consider representation from vocational technical schools in addition to this in order to expand your perspective. This lady here had something to say.

Hamilton: My comments refer to representation of these groups. In reference to what Dr. Weisse said about some people's feelings, I think there should be a representation from the ranking powers of the education professors, and not just through the Dean. In spite of their powers and positions, I think we, as well as those out in the field, have some input.

Williams: Mr. Stoltenberg, were you going to say something?

Stoltenberg: I wanted to ask Marty whether the term "self-study" is really the basic thing we are trying to arrive at? It really is a plan, is it not?

Haberman: Something would be more in that context. Now I think it would be unfortunate if it were assumed or disseminated and publicized that a self-study is to be conducted rather than to emphasize what should be the future teacher education in Wisconsin or at least the hopes and dreams that we have.

Williams: Do you have any additional questions among yourselves or desire to defend yourselves in anything that has been said.

Van Raalte: I am Bob Van Raalte from the DPI, and as I have been listening here this morning it seems to me that there is some general consensus that we are looking at a future of teacher education. I think there has been a great deal of expression on the fact that we are wondering now how we get from where we are to perhaps where we might perceive that we should go. I would like to suggest that this kind of consideration has to be extremely broad because it has to involve, as has been expressed, not only the public institutions, but also publicly supported institutions that are involved in teacher education and a number of private institutions in Wisconsin. It certainly needs to involve teachers, but when we are talking about the teachers in Wisconsin we must remember that despite the size of the WEA there are also other teachers' organizations in Wisconsin. I think we have to remember that we are talking not only about providing teachers for the public elementary and secondary schools of the state, but we are talking about the teachers for the private schools in the state. In Wisconsin this represents large groups of teachers, so that we are talking about a very broadly based program here. It would seem to me that in the last fifteen or twenty minutes what we have been groping for as a group is some kind of machinery whereby we can get this show on the road. I think that's what I perceive to be the problem that we are dealing with at the present time.

It would seem to me that it would be logical, perhaps, for the DPI to accept the challenge at this particular point because we are in a position to involve all of these people perhaps better than any other one agent. I think we are in a better position than the university or the WEA would be, for instance. Therefore, I would like to suggest that perhaps the DPI within the near future would accept the challenge of bringing together a small representative group that might be the beginning of a planning group which in turn would involve all of these people for this kind of development, a Wisconsin Plan for Teacher Education, such as Dr. Haberman was talking about.

Haberman: What would we use the plan for planning? In other words some plan for designing the machinery of who will participate in the decision making, in what terms? That plan has to be developed. That is the first step.

Van Raalte: I would like to suggest that if it is the general consensus of the group represented here this morning, that the DPI could serve in this catalyst role, to get the show in the road. We would accept that challenge.

Larson: NASDEC is proposing that their June conference this year get together leaders from all kinds of educational organizations and attempt to do nationally just exactly what you are talking about here. Here is an organization of only fifty people, no money, no nothing really. It has been their feeling that this getting together is not being fostered by anybody else. They look at the NEA, and they say the NEA is driving its groups farther away from it rather than bringing them in. The superintendents and the principals are being driven out. They look at the AACTE which represents all the college people in the country in teacher education, and they say that AACTE doesn't seem to be interested in getting us all together. They are interested in a college point of view only. So here is NASDEC, this intrepid band of a few people, no financing what-so-ever, going to try this summer to make a start to get all the various families that seem increasingly to be divided from one another, together to isolate and to identify the problems and to begin to make a national cooperative effort toward solving them. What you are suggesting in a sense, then, is that in this state you and the DPI as an agency come to do that same thing and get the dividing or the divided groups together and try to solve the problems. It sounds like a good idea. Maybe you do have the power of the legal agency in the state of Wisconsin.

Williams: Does anybody else have any other response on the panel to this suggestion?

McDonnell: I would have a favorable response to that idea.

Slagle: I would make a comment, too, that of course we do have initial machinery for this sort of arrangement or consortium, and we currently do meet twice annually with the administrative officers. I recognize that is not the group being suggested

to be involved here, but at least it would provide a channel for development of the kind of group that could begin the planning.

McDonnell: I would suggest if you do go about getting this planning session that you include many grass root people in both higher education and in public schools, as well, of course, as you deans. Those people must be included or I don't think it is going to go too far. That is what is wrong with deans' and graduate meetings.

Williams: The suggestion for having a planning group look at a longer range planning has been made. It seems to me this has found favor with the general group. I think it might be helpful if we use the rest of the time for such a planning start and get the names of people who want to perform certain tasks and get going on this. I would like to make a couple of comments on things that should be done during the time that the planning is started.

It seems to me that it is extremely important for the rest of the university community to know what initiation has been taken by the people in the Schools of Education. It is particularly important for the chancellors to know how the initiation has started and what intentions are there and what this may mean concerning the plan coming out for the School of Education. It would seem to me that there must be an opportunity to inform the rest of the university community and the chancellor. This should be taken care of. I think it would be very important to bring a report from this meeting to the Board of Regents, to the education committee, and to the full board telling about such a plan. In other words, now that initiation and a process of planning have started, let's talk about that instead of the tendency to always react. Bring these things to the attention of other people, and then when you have a specific request to make, you will be better prepared to do it.

Larson: Madam chairman, I don't want to talk too much; and I have been debating all morning, and even last night, whether I can say this or not. Let me try to nail it down and make it just a little more emphatic. I may be wrong in my analysis,

but others share this feeling. So maybe where there is a little smoke there is the little fire. I have seen a number of things happening in this country that are completely by-passing us. I'm including me with you. The education commission of the states, which is responsible for a lot of activity in the view of education, has very little if any representation of what you might call professional education. The educators who are there at the commission of the state meetings are presidents of prestigious institutions who are as far away from teacher education as most presidents of prestigious institutions are. The interstate compact is working out details on reciprocity. Al Rearhinder from the State Department and from New York State, got money from one of the titles. He has been working on this, and has completely by-passed you as a community. They have completely by-passed NCATE as an arm of the collegiate community, and they know right where to go to get the stuff passed. They by-pass the educators and go straight to the legislators and are getting what they want. You have not had a voice in it, and you may not even know what they are doing, as a matter of fact.

I make no charges, but I have frierds who are convinced that the U.S. Office of Education has concluded that it will never move you and it is going to by-pass you. I don't know that this is true, but I have friends who will swear to it. The renewal center is going to change teacher education without you. They feel that they don't get enough cooperation or enough movement or enough change from the collegiate organization as it now exists. They are going to by-pass you and leave you in the dust. The only way to get around with something good is to start another kind of organization or another kind of teacher training institution, and they are going to leave you here rather than changing you.

Now some of those things if they are true, even if one of them were true, should be sufficient to tell us to change. If you value anything that you are doing, if you feel you are on the right track, and if you feel you are after a legitimate professional goal without selfish ends, somehow or other some kind of organization

or cooperation or something of the sort is in order for you; or you are going to be left in the dust. I may be wrong, as I said before, and don't carry my tales to Don Davies in the U.S. Office because we are awfully good friends, but a lot of people are saying that they think this is the trend. Then they go back and sight the historical stuff that all these students have in the first course of education. The first system started and proved inadequate and they didn't change it they got a new system, the academy on top and some people say we're at the fourth point right now...It is going to be changed and they are going to leave you alone and start something new, and you will just wither on the vine. This may put a close, Marty, to your plan and give some impetus to the idea that you better get together and organize and bring power to yourselves.

Haberman: I agree with the people who are telling you this, Rolf. That is why I think if we get the practitioners and the administrators and the public with us, the U. S. Office and the other money givers can't subvert our constituency. The reason I want a broad base plan is that that broad base plan will involve those constituents which the Office of Education depends on as our competitors.

Williams: Thank you very much, members of the panel, for participating this morning and thank you for your comments and questions from the audience. It has been a privilege to be with you, and I am optimistic about the future.

Bowman: May I say a word or two and answer a question that was sent up to me. I chose to wait until the end to answer it, because it asked me to please explain to the group why the panel includes no classroom teachers. "It is just like all your higher education meetings--talking for the practitioners." I would like to say that in structuring the panel originally we had asked Mr. James Gutenberg, President of WEA, and reading teacher to serve on the panel for this purpose. He was unable to be here because of NEA business, and he sent a very fine replacement. Of course, we also carefully selected Regent Williams because she is not only a regent and a fine moderator but she is also a student teacher who at this point is about to enter classroom teaching.

At some risk I want to make a point as briefly and effectively as I can. I would like to ask all those faculty members in my School of Education who in the past twelve months have in some way or another been a practitioner in a classroom with a group of elementary school youngsters or junior high school youngsters or senior high school students, or learning disability students, etc., please rise. (About 20 or 90% of the School of Education faculty rose.) I think the point is obvious. (Many local faculty members are involved directly with children. They are not just speaking for the practitioners. They are practitioners.)

I see the sun is beginning to peek through and the roads should be safe to return to your home. I think we will dispense with the sessions with individual panelists. Instead we will allow you to talk with them here, then we will ask a few of the panelists and some of the interested members of the audience who would like to do a little planning for next steps to meet with me. Otherwise, we are adjourned. Thank you for coming and have a safe journey home.

Highlights of the Panel Discussion

Among questions raised by members of the panel moderated by Mrs. Robert R. Williams were whether teacher education should be a professional school at the graduate level instead of part of a four-year course, whether there should be stricter certification requirements, and whether there should be enrollment quotas for persons planning to go into teacher education.

Dr. Martin Haberman proposed a year-long self-study of the teacher education program and suggested that each of the thirteen schools in the university system "kick in $5,000" for such a study. Robert Van Raalte, Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction in charge of Instructional Services, suggested that the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction could serve as the catalytic agent to form a planning committee for launching such a study. He offered to take this back to the DPI. A study of teacher education programs should involve the private colleges having teacher preparation programs and the public and private schools which employ teachers. A broad-based study, from the "grass roots", seems important.

The question was raised of uniformity of student quotas within the system. Madison and Milwaukee campuses have quota restrictions on students entering their schools of education, while other institutions within the system have open admissions policies. Dr. Allen Slagle, head of academic affairs of the University of Wisconsin System, said he could not advocate any limit on enrollment for teacher education. He emphasized the idea that teacher education is good general education, even if a person does not actually become a teacher.

John McDonnell, field consultant in higher education for the Wisconsin Education Association emphasized the need for input by the practitioners regarding any teacher education programs. A year's internship as a teacher in a classroom prior to actual certification, rather than automatic certification after graduation was discussed by the group.

Relationships between various segments of professional educators have many ramifications. Dr. Rolf Larson, Executive Director of NCATE, reminded the group that Maine teachers have served notice on the University system of that state that they would boycott its courses unless they could have some voice in determining the teacher preparation curriculum. Dr. Allen Quick pointed out that the same type of action had been threatened in the State of Michigan. John McDonnell added that "there has been some talk about WEA and the Council of Education doing evaluation of teacher education institutions."

Dr. Haberman reemphasized that teachers must have a voice in the selection of those to be prepared for the profession and in the actual certification selection. "I would like to hit hard on a year of self-study. We need a year of solid planning to get ahead of show-down as in Maine . . ."

It was recognized that as the financing of schools moves away from use of property tax, all institutions . . . elementary through graduate schools . . . will be competing for the same funds.

Dr. Larson added a final word of warning that for survival, teacher preparation institutions must find alternatives and must develop new relationships and lines of communication with professional teacher organizations. An awareness of the changing trends in accreditation methods is of paramount importance.

Post-Panel Discussion Session

In a short session following the morning discussion a specific and concrete effort was made toward a plan of operation for the next steps. The need is a mixed professional group planning for the future of education in Wisconsin. The central problem was planning for a planning group, pinpointing responsibility for beginning.

Dean David Bowman made two suggestions:

1. The group delegate one person to call together a planning group.
2. The group respectfully requested that Mrs. Robert Williams speak to the chancellors about meeting with their respective deans of education regarding a planning group. The hope is that this will produce action, allowing for the planning of a responsible action group.

Such planning group seems imperative to the future of education in Wisconsin. All interested and concerned groups (of educators) should be involved.

It was further determined that Lond Rodman and Robert Van Raalte of the Department of Public Instruction and Dr. Allen Slagle would serve as a nucleus for the initial planning committee.

E.J.P.

APPENDIX A

Participants in Conference

Ambrose, Paul - UW-Superior
*Ashley, Sue - V.Pres., SNEA
Bauer, Roger - UW-Stevens Point
Beighley, Kenneth - UW-Platteville
Bermingham, Mrs. Barbara - UW-Oshkosh
Betts, Sister Julian - UW-Oshkosh
Bjorge, John - Superintendent, Berlin
Bolen, John - UW-Stevens Point
Bolsta - Assistant Dean, UW-Stout
Bowman, David L. - Dean, School of Education, UW-Oshkosh
*Breuer, Suzanne - Sec., SCEC
Brown, Daniel - UW-River Falls
Buckley, Richard - UW-Oshkosh
Burgett, Russell - UW-Platteville
Bush, James - UW-Green Bay
Carlson, Gertrude -UW-Stout
Carstens, Paul - UW-Oshkosh
Caudle, Jean - UW-Oshkosh
Chandler, Arnold - DPI-Madison
Check, John - UW-Oshkosh
Crombie, Richard - H.S., Oshkosh
Crouse, Harold - UW-Oshkosh
Daniel, Edythe - UW-Platteville
Darken, Arthur - Dean, School of Letters & Science, UW-Oshkosh
Das Gupta, Anata - UW-Platteville
Dickmann, Leonore - UW-Oshkosh
*Doro, Sue - Sec., ACE
*Drafz, Donna - SNEA
Duren, Alice - UW-Oshkosh
Eherenmann, William - UW-Platteville
Ekvall, Allan T. - UW-Oshkosh
Ellis, G. Gordon - UW-Oshkosh
Elmore, Jack - UW-Parkside
*Engelhardt, Ralph - Kappa Delta Pi
*Engmann, Mr. & Mrs. James - Pres. Student Government
Eye, Glen G. - UW-Madison
Fessler, Ralph - UW-River Falls
Field, Robert - UW-Oshkosh
Fisher, Mary - UW-Platteville
Fitzgerald, Paul - UW-Oshkosh
Foote, Jerry - UW-Eau Claire
Frankland, Elizabeth - UW-Oshkosh
Freese, Theron - UW-Oshkosh
Frenzel, Norman - UW-Oshkosh
Fritschel, Arthur - UW-Stevens Point
*Gabbert, Mary E. - Co-Pres., ACE
Gallagher, Neil - UW-Platteville
*Gartland, Ann - Kappa Delta Pi
Gibbs, Ronald K. - UW-Oshkosh
*Giese, Paulette - V. Pres., SCEC
Grage, Duane - UW-Oshkosh
Guiang, Honesta - UW-Oshkosh
Guiles, Roger E. - Chancellor, UW-Oshkosh
Haberman, Martin - UW-Milwaukee
Hadley, C.M. - UW-Oshkosh
Hamilton, Dorothy - UW-Oshkosh
Hammes, Richard - UW-Oshkosh
Hartig, Mary - UW-Oshkosh
Havens, Robert - UW-Oshkosh
Hayes, Tom - UW-Stevens Point
Herold, Roger - Sheboygan
Hiob, Eileen - UW-Oshkosh
Hoglund, Mary - UW-Oshkosh
Hutcheson, Harold - UW-Platteville
Hutchison , E.J. - UW-Oshkosh
Ingle, Robert - UW-Milwaukee
Johnson, Jackie - DPI-Madison
Johnson, James K. - UW-Oshkosh
Johnson, Jerry - UW-Eau Claire
Johnson, Rodney - UW-Eau Claire
Johnston, William - UW-Whitewater
Jones, William - UW-Oshkosh
Karls, John B. - UW-Milwaukee
Kean, John - UW-Madison
Kempf, Thomas - UW-Oshkosh
Kirby, William - UW-Stevens Point
Kliebard, Herbert - UW-Madison
Klink, Rowland - UW-River Falls
Koll, Patricia - UW-Oshkosh
Korsgaard, Ross - UW-River Falls
*Koss, Mary Ann - Treas., ACE
Kuhn, David - UW-Parkside
Lang, Leo - Superintendent, Campbellsport
Larson, Al - Wis. Assoc. of School Boards, Chilton
Larson, Rolf - Exec. Director, NCATE
Lawrence, John P. - DPI-Madison
Leffin, Walter - UW-Oshkosh
Lesnick, Ralph - Coordinator of Secondary Schools, Oshkosh
Linton, Stanley - UW-Oshkosh
Lynch, Dan - UW-Oshkosh
Lynch, Mrs. Dan - Oshkosh

*Students

Participants in Conference (continued)

McCarty, Don - UW-Madison
McDonnell, James - WEA Field Consultant
Beloit College
McKeag, Robert - UW-Oshkosh
Manion, Gayle - UW-Superior
Master, Larry - UW-Oshkosh
Matson, Wesley - Minnesota
Melville, William - UW-Platteville
Moldenhauer, Al - DPI-Madison
Monroe, H. Virginia - UW-Oshkosh
Mook, John R. - UW-Oshkosh
Moore, Edwin - UW-Platteville
Morris, Tom - UW-Platteville
Morris, William H. - UW-Oshkosh
Morrison, Kenneth - UW-Oshkosh
Mrdjenovich, Donald - Watertown
Mueller, Mary Martha - UW-Oshkosh
Nagel, Paul - UW-Eau Claire
Narron, Dawn - UW-Stevens Point
Nasgowitz, Mildred - UW-Oshkosh
O'Brien, Elaine - UW-Oshkosh
O'Hearn, George - UW-Green Bay
Olson, James - UW-Milwaukee
Overton, Elizabeth - UW-Oshkosh
Pearce, Dr. Harry - UW-Platteville
Pearce, Mrs. Harry - Platteville
Pella, Milton - UW-Madison
Pence, Lois - UW-Oshkosh
Perrin, J. Mark - UW-River Falls
Petersen, Kay - UW-Madison
Pickering, Robert S. - UW-Oshkosh
Podeschl, Ron - UW-Milwaukee
Poole, Max - UW-Eau Claire
Postiglione, William - UW-River Falls
Purcell, EdnaJean - UW-Oshkosh
Pyle, Everett - UW-Oshkosh
Quick, Alan F. - Central Michigan Univ.
Quick, Donald - UW-Oshkosh
Raby, William - UW-Oshkosh
Ramsden, Raymond J. - Acad. Vice Pres.,
UW-Oshkosh
Riedl, Eugene - Hortonville
Rock, Dolores - UW-Platteville
Rodman, Lond - DPI-Madison
Rusch, Carroll - UW-Superior
Schild, Richard - UW-Milwaukee
Schimke, Milton - UW-Eau Claire
Schmalzried, Donald - UW-Eau Claire
Schmidt, Reinhardt - UW-Stout
Schmitt, Bernard - Sheboygan
Schneck, George - UW-Oshkosh
Slagle, Allen - Head of Academic Affairs,
UW System
Smith, Billie - UW-Oshkosh
*Smith, Elaine Anderson - V.Pres.,
Student Government
Snowden, Terry - UW-Stevens Point
Snyder, Henry - UW-Milwaukee
*Spalding, Kathleen A. - Co-Pres.,ACE
Spoerri, Irvin - Fond du Lac
Stahl, Earl - UW-Oshkosh
Stamm, Wayne - DPI-Madison
Stamm, Mrs. Wayne - Madison
Stankevitz, Ervin - Plymouth
Stewart, Harold - Superintendent,
Oshkosh Public Schools
Stillman, John - UW-Milwaukee
Stoltenberg, James - Exec. Sec.,
W.I.P., UW-Madison
Taylor, Paul - UW-Oshkosh
Theune, Warren - UW-Whitewater
Thompson, Claud - UW-Oshkosh
Thrall, Esther - UW-Oshkosh
Tipler, Perry - Former Superintendent
of Schools, Oshkosh
Trauba, Robert - UW-Superior
Valney, Evabelle - UW-Oshkosh
Van Dreser, Roy - UW-Stevens Point
Van Raalte, Robert - DPI-Madison
Vertein, Dale - UW-Platteville
*Wallace, Marilyn - Sec., SNEA
Walton, Tom - UW-Milwaukee
Warpinski, Robert J. - Green Bay CESA
Watson, James - UW-Oshkosh
Wehner, Freda - UW-Oshkosh
Weisse, Ed - UW-Oshkosh
White, Everett - UW-Whitewater
White, William - UW-Oshkosh
*Wiegel, Richard - Counselor Ed.
Williams, Mrs. Robert R. - Board of
Regents, UW System
Williams, Shirley - UW-Oshkosh
Wilsmann, Howard E. - Manitowoc
Winters, Elmer - UW-Eau Claire
Winther, W.I. - UW-Whitewater
Wisniewski, Richard - UW-Milwaukee
Wolff, Harry - UW-Oshkosh
*Wollangk, Edith
Woods, Margaret - UW-Platteville
Woods, R.K. - UW-Platteville
Young, Bernie - UW-La Crosse
Zalas, Ben - UW-Oshkosh

APPENDIX B

A Brainstorming Session

"Future Directions for Teacher Education in Wisconsin"

During the Friday afternoon workshop session, one discussion group, led by Dr. Leonore Dickmann, participated in a thirty minute brainstorming session. The members were concerned about directions which teacher preparation could or should take in the future. Approximately 160 ideas were generated.

The ideas have been rearranged into loosely defined categories, for the ease of the reader. The list of ideas, as they were expressed by participants, follows:

University Wisconsin System Issues

Public relations department to explain new educational practices

Redesign of mission statements in teacher education

Better communication between schools in the University Wisconsin System

Determine the purposes of Schools of Education in the new system

Meeting common needs

Establish committees to generate ideas

Exchange of staff members within the system

Status of university laboratory and campus schools

Research and development in the affective domain

Increased funding for education

Clarification of roles and responsibility of teacher educators

Schools of Education - Public School Issues

Establish parity among all groups involved in education

Develop closer relationships with public schools

Improved usage of public schools as laboratories

Emphasis on centers for student teaching

Provide communication between experienced teachers and neophytes

Methods courses taught with public school teachers

Change of assessment and evaluation practices in public schools

Coordination of public school and college curricula

Closer relationships between educational agencies and experiences outside of school

Evaluate impact of teacher aides

Implications of staff differentiation for teachers and teacher aides

Reeducation of administrators

Separation of school curriculum directors from administrative duties

Money to bring public school teachers to university classes

Make known availability of free teaching materials

Public schools develop programs for in-service and credit for taking extra courses

Define pre-service and in-service education and the responsibilities for each

Teacher centered concepts in in-service training

Establish parity among all groups involved in education

Experiences and Curriculum in Teacher Preparation

More student participation experiences

Individualized instruction in teacher preparation

Increased preparation in using technology

Opportunity for independent study and self-directed learning

Preparation for new systems of teaching

Instruction for cluster concepts

Teaching for thinking and learning to learn

Versatility, flexibility, and adaptability to meet new needs and situations

Modular learning

Student involvement in teaching their university classes

Preparation to deal with "special" children

More opportunity for off-campus learning; advisors, cassettes, television

Use of behavioral objectives in methods courses

Involvement in peer teaching and early teaching experiences

Study interaction analysis between teacher and student and between students and students

Provide interdisciplinary preparation and experiences.

Exchanges between teachers of discipline areas

Provide work in group dynamics

More specialization in the disciplines

Quality preparation with and for flexibility

Preparation to teach various ethnic groups

Future directions for areas of preparation in specific programs

Projection of future needs in education: what to teach?

Field Experiences

Field experiences for students earlier in university careers . . . sandwiched into the preparation program

Student teaching at any place in the state

Students "floating" from campus to campus

Student teaching in other countries as pre-professional experience

Emphasis on the Affective

Improved screening of candidates on the basis of personal qualities

Personal development as a part of teacher preparation

Teach interpersonal relationships

Emphasis on human relations

Development of sensibility and ability to develop humaneness

Improve the longevity or "staying power" of teachers in the profession

Redefine success in teaching

Define the successful student

Examination of the characteristics of successful teachers

General Concerns for Teacher Educators

Pass/no credit system in all professional courses

Improve pre-service training

Alternatives to present teacher education programs

Predict major emphases to study in terms of future needs.

Improved advisement for teacher education students

Voucher system in teacher education

Improved and clarified mechanics of passing or not passing students through the educational machine

Opening of teacher education to new control, methods, and organization

Specialization vs diversity

Greater control of human and material resources

Evaluation and assessment of the product of teacher education programs

Examine the results of teacher education programs and identify the characteristics of successful ones

Student designed majors

Recruit master teachers for Schools of Education

Closer relationships between Schools of Education and Schools of Letters and Science

Teacher education as one of the liberal arts

Examine the purposes of education as an intellectual enterprise vs preparation for the job market

Clarify future roles of tutorial programs

Selection of students

Extension of preparation beyond 4 years

Reduce time for teacher preparation

Major - only certification

Elimination of life-time certification

Elimination of tenure

Coordination of graduate and under-graduate educational programs

Internship before final pre-service training experience

More emphasis on performance criteria

Competency based teacher education

Post baccalaureate field experience

Require baccalaureate degree before entry to teacher education

Follow up by university on new teachers as practitioners

Earlier identification of potential excellence in teachers

Require students to write a justification for wanting to enter teacher education

Early identification of competencies

Close examination of college entrance requirements

Close examination of teacher education requirements

Close examination of general education requirements